



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2023

No. 45

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Illinois).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 9, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARY E. MILLER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

SAD ANNIVERSARY FOR UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, as we reflect on the 1-year anniversary of Putin's war against Ukraine, it cannot help but remind us of why we fought in the Second World War and that the fight in Ukraine embodies the very same principles we fought for in the Second World War.

First: Preventing authoritarian regimes from wiping out sovereign democratic countries.

Ukraine is a sovereign democratic nation. They have held free and fair elections since 1991. They have freedom of expression, press, and speech, while Russia is an autocratic nation led by an authoritarian dictator who represses personal expression, the free press, and free speech. He invaded Ukraine expressly to expand his sphere of autocratic control and subvert the will of the free people of Ukraine.

The second principle: To prevent further genocide.

Putin's invasion has been characterized by the commission of war crimes. One year ago this month, Russian forces deliberately targeted a civilian shelter. That same month they struck a children's hospital and maternity ward. The next month, over 400 bodies of civilians were found in mass graves in Bucha after the city was liberated. In September, 450 bodies, mostly of civilians, were found in mass graves in Kharkiv.

I visited Ukraine last summer, where I met with President Zelenskyy and traveled to Bucha and saw the mass graves firsthand.

In the Second World War, we vowed, "Never again." Removing ourselves from this effort would be an egregious breach of that commitment and would demonstrate that we have not learned the lessons of those who gave their last full measure of devotion in the Second World War.

The third principle we defended in World War II was the preservation of a liberal world democratic order.

As we have seen in history, the actions of one autocratic nation can inspire the actions of others. Allowing Russia to conquer Ukraine will send the message to other autocrats that their expansion to free nations will not be opposed. This cannot be the future we allow.

President Biden's recent historic trip to Kyiv highlighted these reasons, but it also recalled the words of FDR in his

last inaugural address in the months leading up to the end of that great conflict. He said, "We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations far away."

"We have learned the simple truth, as Emerson said, that 'The only way to have a friend is to be one.' We can gain no lasting peace if we approach it with suspicion and mistrust or with fear."

Just as the world has borne witness to Putin's relentless violence, we have seen the resilience and determination of the Ukrainian people. Their fight is the reason we formed the United Nations and NATO in the first place. Quite simply, they have earned that support.

As President Zelenskyy said:

Aid is not charity, it is an investment in the global security and democracy.

He is right.

Our efforts to defend Ukraine are to protect Ukraine's right to self-determination and protect the future of democracy around the globe.

We are, indeed, facing a turning point in this war, and I am reminded of Winston Churchill's words after Britain's victory in the second battle of El Alamein: "Now this is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning."

We are today at the end of the beginning of Putin's campaign in Ukraine and his efforts to recreate the Soviet Union. We must be united in our efforts to defend Ukraine and democracy.

FULL FAITH AND CREDIT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I thank the Ways and Means Committee

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1211

for taking up my bill, H.R. 187, the Default Prevention Act, today.

Similar bills I introduced passed this House in 2013 and 2015, and I am gratified the committee would take it up in this session. The bill simply provides that even if there is a fiscal impasse in our deliberations over the debt limit, the debt of the United States will always be paid in full and on time.

Frankly, that is already the law. Our revenues vastly exceed our debt service costs. As every family knows, if you are living off your credit cards, you better make the minimum payment first. The law and the Constitution require it.

The organic act that established the Treasury Department in 1789 is clear on this point: “. . . it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to digest and prepare plans for the improvement and management of the revenue, and for the support of public credit. . . .”

I repeat: The management of the revenue and the support of public credit.

The Constitution is also crystal clear. The 14th Amendment commands that the public debt is not to be questioned. The GAO spelled it out so there would be no doubt when they answered the Senate Finance Committee in 1985, “The Treasury is free to liquidate obligations in any order it finds will best serve the interests of the United States.”

Yet, over the years, various Presidents have threatened to default on the debt as a way to roil markets and pressure lawmakers to bend to their will. This President, sadly, is no different.

Even while the Obama Treasury Department was denying it had the ability to prioritize payments to pay the debt first, we later discovered it was making preparations to do exactly that. We also discovered documents that revealed that Federal Reserve officials were appalled that the administration would ever suggest defaulting because such statements ran a severe risk of panicking credit markets. We are hearing those same statements today from some Democrats in this Congress and in this administration.

The Default Prevention Act simply takes this threat off the table. Amendments being offered by the committee also require priority be given to Social Security, Medicare, and defense to assure no President can threaten to hold seniors or servicemembers or veterans hostage, as well.

Nor is this unusual. Most State constitutions provide that first call on any revenues is to maintain and protect their sovereign credit. Indeed, several years ago, in testimony to the Senate, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke praised these State provisions for maintaining confidence in State-issued bonds.

This is not to endorse a prolonged impasse over the debt limit. Postponing prompt payment of other bills is not a good thing, but the full faith and credit of our country is funda-

mental to paying all of those other bills, and that is why we should prevent any President from threatening to default on that credit.

The most preposterous claim we hear is that this prioritizes paying China before other obligations. The fact is, most debt is held by Americans, including most likely your pension fund. China holds about 3.2 percent of our bonds.

The debt limit is there for a reason. If your family is living beyond its means and needs to seek an increase in its credit limit, it had better sit down around the kitchen table and have a very serious discussion over the circumstances that have gotten it into this predicament and what steps it needs to take to get out. That is why we have a debt limit, to have exactly that discussion as a nation.

That is why it is so disturbing when the President says he is not even willing to discuss the subject. Well, considering the fact that he has added \$3.7 trillion to the national debt in just 25 months in office, that is irresponsible.

Not discuss it? Why in the world does he think we have this building with the dome on top at the very center of our Capital City?

It was built exclusively to have these discussions, to talk out our differences, and to reach a wise and satisfactory conclusion for our public policy questions.

Not discuss the biggest fiscal threat our Nation has ever faced?

He can't be serious.

However, serious or not, no President should have the ability to threaten to default on our debt, to destroy the full faith and credit of the government, or to take hostage our seniors, our veterans, and our other servicemembers. This bill prevents him from ever threatening to do so again, and it needs to be enacted.

TUSKEGEE AIRMEN NATIONAL MUSEUM PILOT TRAINING PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Tuskegee Airmen National Museum in Detroit for securing \$500,000 in grant funding for its pilot training program from the Federal Aviation Administration.

The Tuskegee Airmen National Museum was originally founded to record and honor the unsung but substantial contributions of our Nation's first Black military airmen.

Madam Speaker, the museum has grown to operate from three different locations across the city of Detroit, including the Charles H. Wright African American History Museum, historic Fort Wayne, and the Coleman A. Young municipal airport, where it offers career training programs for young people interested in aviation and aerospace science.

The museum takes particular pride in its community engagement around aviation training, which has been in operation for more than 30 years. \$500,000 will go a long way in their flight training program which is offered to young people age 14-19 in the metropolitan Detroit area and puts students on the path toward obtaining a private pilot's license. I wish you could have seen the excited faces when I went to one of their events for young people, again, learning to fly.

The museum works in partnership with many of our local organizations and universities to connect the many interested students with training and resources.

I say this wholeheartedly, I am so proud that our own government, the Federal Aviation Administration, sees the gem that the Tuskegee Airmen National Museum is. Their training program and the unique opportunities they offer to our young people is truly a huge contribution to Wayne County, Michigan. Again, I am pleased to see the FAA see a tremendous value in their work.

WAR IN YEMEN

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today to uplift the Yemeni people who have been suffering from the inhumane and violent war. We are approaching the eighth anniversary of the start of the war in Yemen.

We must stop U.S. participation in this war. It is far past time for us to reiterate our support for ending U.S. ties to and support for the Saudi coalition.

After over 10 months now without airstrikes in Yemen, the Yemeni people want to ensure that these airstrikes never resume.

Indiscriminate bombing of civilian targets, including hospitals, schools, water treatment plants, as well as blockading Yemeni ports—committed largely with U.S. weapons and logistical support—have resulted in what the U.N. has described as the world's worst humanitarian crisis with millions of Yemenis pushed to the edge of famine.

Again, the United States must stop any participation in this horrific war.

Over 11,000 children have died of hunger or been maimed as a result of the conflict in Yemen, according to UNICEF, an average, Madam Speaker, of four a day since the escalation of the conflict in 2015. Across Yemen, 23.4 million people are in need of humanitarian assistance.

The Yemeni-American families in my district are devastated to see their families, their native cities, the neighborhoods they all grew up in completely ripped apart with death, famine, and violent attacks.

“May Allah cure you.” “Allah yshfeekom.”

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN POLITICS

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of Women's History Month. I cannot think of any better way to recognize and honor women than to take active steps in protecting them.

This week, I am reintroducing House Resolution 801 that recognizes violence against women in politics is a global phenomenon now and that more research should be conducted to examine its extent and effects in the United States.

There is a disturbing rise of violence against women in politics. We have all experienced it in this Chamber. The never-ending string of ignorant, hateful, and downright threatening rhetoric against colleagues in this room is extremely unacceptable, and it is the same kind of hate that is directed against countless women all around the globe, especially women of color and those with cross-cutting identities.

Madam Speaker, women have been on the frontlines of social justice movements around the world and throughout our Nation's history. Violence against women in politics is a specific, gendered phenomenon, stemming from a resistance to increased political participation by women intended, again, to undermine women as political actors.

According to the "2018 Violence Against Women in Politics Report" by U.N. Women and U.N. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, it says that women of color are increasingly more affected by this crisis.

□ 1015

A recent study by U.S. mayors found that women mayors are more likely than men to experience most types of violence and abuse and indicates such incidents are not out of the ordinary for women in U.S. politics generally.

In honor of Women's History Month, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

HONORING TINA TYUS SHAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tina Tyus Shaw, who is going to be inducted into the Georgia Association of Broadcasters Hall of Fame this month.

Those who watch WSAV-TV in Savannah know that Ms. Shaw has been a key part of our local news coverage since 1992. Her 30 years of service have brought reliable news coverage to homes in Georgia's First District on a consistent basis.

Ms. Shaw is certainly not a stranger to winning awards for her work in local news either. She has won dozens of awards for broadcasting, including the National Murrow Award for Best Newscast.

In addition to her regular broadcasting duties, Ms. Shaw is a key player in the fight against breast cancer. She created the "Buddy Check 3," a breast cancer detection program, which has saved many lives thanks to early detection.

Ms. Shaw's commitment to her local community and her State are a testament to her character.

I cannot think of anyone more deserving of being inducted into the Georgia Association of Broadcasters Hall of Fame.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF SANDRA MARTIN

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Sandra Martin, a loving mother, wife, and leader from the great State of Georgia.

A native of Cuthbert, Georgia, Sandra was the class valedictorian at Randolph Junior/Senior High School in 1971.

Sandra met and married the love of her life, John F. Martin, Sr., of Flemington, more than 50 years ago.

She would go on to work at the Heritage Bank for 40 years and held many titles, including vice president.

In addition to her career at Heritage Bank, she was a dedicated public servant. Sandra was elected to the Flemington City Council in 1981 and later served as mayor of Flemington from 1997 to 2017.

Sandra loved traveling, spending time with her family, and was a committed member of Flemington Presbyterian Church.

A lifelong servant to her community, Sandra's impact on the State of Georgia will be felt for generations to come. She will be dearly missed.

RECOGNIZING TRACE CARTER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Trace Carter, an accomplished student golfer at Ware County High School.

Barely 2 years into his high school career, Trace is the reigning club champion at Okefenokee Country Club, highly ranked by the American Junior Golf Association, and finished as the boys' 14 to 15 runner-up at the Drive, Chip, and Putt National Finals at Augusta National Golf Club.

Since competing in his first tournament in 2015, Trace has found tremendous success, finishing second and third the past 2 years at the Okefenokee invitational. He also helped lead Ware County High School to a region title and a top-five finish at the State championship his freshman year.

Golf has always been an important part of Trace's family, as his mom and dad both played on State championship teams at Pierce County High School. Chase's grandfather, Royce Carter, my dear friend, and one of my earliest supporters, instilled in him the love of golf at a very young age.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Trace on his accomplishments. I am excited to see what he will achieve in the years to come.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF ANNE HODNETT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Anne Hodnett, a loving mother, wife, and dedicated volunteer in her community.

A native of Henry County, Virginia, Anne grew up during the Great Depression, the youngest of eight children.

Anne later married Roy K. Hodnett, a veteran of World War II.

In 1968, the Hodnetts moved to St. Simons Island where Anne was an active volunteer throughout her community. Anne used her many talents, such as cooking and organizing, to cultivate a thriving community. She volunteered at St. Simons United Methodist Church, The Gathering Place, Manna House, MAP International, Amity House, and the Island Players, where she was a "life member."

Another passion Anne had was for the stage. She acted in more than 30 plays and produced nearly 50 of her own. Anne operated her own dinner theater for several years, entertaining tour groups with light comedies and Lowcountry boils on their visits to the island.

Anne will be dearly missed. Our thoughts and prayers are with her and her family.

MAGA POLITICAL PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, you have probably heard the Republican majority tell you they are laser focused on reducing costs for the average American by lowering inflation. You have likely heard about their alleged quest for a smaller, less-intrusive government. Yup, I have heard them, too.

Well, this week in Congress clearly shows they didn't mean any of that. In fact, quite the opposite.

Just yesterday, Republicans showed their real priorities—partisan ultra-MAGA political priorities—by considering a trans and intersex sports ban as their opening salvo in their efforts to undermine the rights of LGBTQ+ people.

Here are the facts. Young people participate in sports to be part of a team, learn sportsmanship, and challenge themselves. It is about friendships and learning to work together as a team. The GOP sports ban seeks to strip trans girls of all ages of these opportunities.

Look, there are real, pressing problems impacting women's and girls' sports, including sexual harassment and assault, lack of equal resources, and pay inequality. These are real issues that the GOP majority is ignoring.

There are pressing problems facing kids of our Nation, including nearly 50,000 gun deaths a year, including more than 4,700 that involve kids; but not a peep from the Republicans in Congress about something that is actually killing children.

Rather than addressing any of these issues, anti-equality politicians on the Committee on Education and the Workforce spent their first legislative markup this session targeting the few trans girls and women who participate in school sports.

When it comes to protecting women's sports, we should look to leading women's sports and gender justice organizations like the Women's Sports Foundation and the National Women's Law

Center. Both organizations, as well as leading women athletes, support transgender inclusion in sports.

Major athletic bodies such as the International Olympic Committee and NCAA have guidelines for the participation of transgender athletes, and these bodies reject the type of systematic exclusion of transgender people from sports that anti-LGBTQ+ politicians are pushing.

This isn't about a real problem in this Nation. This is part of a larger coordinated attack against transgender people and the larger LGBTQ+ population. We have seen hundreds of anti-equality bills, many specifically targeting transgender people introduced in States across the country this year.

Unfortunately, this is about building the personal brand of some extreme rightwing politicians, people who fundraise from and appeal to a small subset of their political base, rather than about a real problem in this country.

These bullying politicians will endanger the lives of trans kids for their own political purposes, seemingly with the support of GOP leadership.

I guess we shouldn't be surprised. Not one Republican in leadership called out the comments last week by a conservative speaker at the CPAC conference who called for the eradication of transgender people.

This isn't about sports. This is about attacking trans and LGBTQ+ kids and the extreme MAGA politics of that issue, not the substance of just letting kids play. That is heartless and cruel.

We will fight these attacks hard. We will call out this dangerous demagoguery, and we will make sure the public sees it for what it is—raw, swampy politics, as usual, of the worst kind.

There will be few pages assigned to future chapters of "Profiles in Courage" for the politicians that bully kids for their own gain. This week, that is exactly what we saw from the majority party in Congress, and we will expose this opportunistic bullying.

NO AMERICAN IS SAFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. STRONG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRONG. Madam Speaker, I rise because no American is safe.

The United States Secretary of Homeland Security says that the American border is secure. The American people know better.

It is for these reasons I traveled to our southern border with several of my colleagues from the Committee on Homeland Security. Two adults attempted to climb the U.S. border fence the day we got there. They fell and were critically injured. American taxpayers are paying the bill.

Hospitals are inundated with non-U.S. citizens. They are not paying a dime for care.

Schools and teachers are attempting to teach students that are here unlaw-

fully. Many don't speak English, and they are delaying the education of those who do.

Illegal aliens attacked a Border Patrol agent while we were there. They are trying to kill American law enforcement agents. Under this administration, these agents in many cases are instructed to respond by firing pepper balls.

Some schools are placed on lockdown 4 to 10 times a week because Border Patrol agents are chasing drug dealers and human smugglers that have crossed the border and entered their elementary and middle school campuses.

Cartel members are recruiting 11- to 14-year-old children to drive vehicles to smuggle illegal aliens through multiple States and counties.

Practically everyone crossing illegally claims asylum. Think about it, they are coming from Mexico, Guatemala, Ecuador, Colombia, Haiti, Cuba, El Salvador, Iran, and, yes, they are coming from China, too. They are flying, in many cases, to the southern border to cross illegally.

Our meeting at the border port of entry had to be delayed because a mule tried to smuggle 70 pounds of cocaine right in front of 12 United States Congressmen.

The American people are being told by the Secretary of Homeland Security that our borders are secure. There is nothing further from the truth. While heroin, fentanyl, cocaine, marijuana, and human smuggling are flowing into our country at alarming rates, America is under attack.

The same laws in effect today were in effect when Donald Trump was President of the United States of America. You can talk about him all you want, but tell the facts. He sent them back and protected America.

Two weeks ago, President Trump's Border Patrol chief, Rodney Scott, gave us a brief. He said the problem is not with the laws; the problem is with this administration because they are not enforcing the laws that are already on the books. It is time to return these that are invading our country at the southern border to the country of their origin immediately.

On average, 300 United States men, women, and children are dying every day by overdose. EMTs, paramedics, nurses, doctors, and emergency rooms see it every day. America is under attack.

On our visit to the border, we met with Texas National Guard, United States Homeland Security, Border Patrol, Customs and Immigration, Homeland Security Investigations, and the Texas State Troopers.

Not one of these agencies or officials we met with could say that the U.S. border was secure. Not one.

Drug overdoses are a common occurrence in every county and city in America. This threat to America does not discriminate; rich, poor, Black, White. This is not a Democratic issue, nor is it a Republican issue. It is an

American issue. Our country is under attack.

No American is safe, and the American people deserve better.

During our trip, I was reminded that on his first day in office, the President terminated the emergency declaration at the southern border and halted border wall construction.

Over the last 2 years, U.S. Customs and Border Patrol have encountered over 4.7 million illegal immigrants trying to enter our country. That does not include the 1.2 million that have evaded Border Patrol. Yet, the administration tells the American people that the border is under control.

□ 1030

If our border is secure, then why over the last 2 years has the administration continued to send troops to our border? That alone signals to every American that we have a problem.

Why are they stopping border wall construction, which is an important first step in securing our border? I will introduce legislation to address this question.

My bill will resume border wall construction and ensure the President cannot withhold resources while sending our troops to the front line. Our country is under attack.

I am proud to introduce this legislation and other measures to ensure that if the administration expects our troops to defend our border, then we expect the administration to provide every tool, resource, and means of support to each of our brave men and women protecting our homeland security.

My fellow Americans, our country is under attack.

HONORING KEITH ABOUCHAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today, as I have in the past, on this floor for Republican staffers and Democratic staffers to thank them, to thank them for their service to the House of Representatives, for their service to the Congress of the United States, and for their service to individual Members and to leadership.

I do so again today for my friend who was with me for approximately a quarter of a century, Dr. Keith Abouchar. He has long served as my senior policy adviser on everything from oversight and financial services to congressional ethics and campaign finance.

After working with me for a few years as a professional staff member of the House Oversight Committee and the Committee on House Administration, he joined my leadership staff in 2003.

He recently retired at the beginning of this year from Federal service after serving this institution, as I said, for more than a quarter of a century.

Keith Abouchar, Dr. Abouchar, accomplished much in that time. He

played an instrumental role in negotiating the Help America Vote Act, spending many early mornings and late nights to enact a law that The Washington Post later called “the most significant piece of Federal election law since the Voting Rights Act.”

Congratulations, Keith.

Similarly, he was integral to helping us pass the ADA Amendments Act in 2008, which strengthened and carried out the intent of Congress for the ADA and for future generations.

Keith was also a steadfast advocate for our Federal employees and went to great lengths to stave off repeated partisan attempts to cut their pay and benefits and security.

Perhaps the most significant result of Keith's time in my office, of course, was his marriage to a fellow staffer whose name is Jane. Once coworkers, they are now parents to two incredible children, Adele and Henry. He cherishes his role as their father above all else.

It is in this spirit why, when looking back on my time with Keith, I don't think of the list of groundbreaking laws he helped enact, though that list is long. Instead, I think the virtues he displayed every day here on Capitol Hill are what I remember.

Keith has a doctorate in political science. He is an epic consumer of the printed word. You would typically find him with his head buried in the mountain of papers on his desk. He made frequent use of the Library of Congress, read multiple newspapers daily, and often left the office with a cache of unread papers under his arm.

Few can match Keith's mastery of technical details behind the issues on which he worked. Even fewer share his ability to understand how these details impact Americans' everyday lives.

That talent is rooted in Keith's thoughtful demeanor. Quick to offer a piece of wisdom, a word of encouragement, or an expression of gratitude, Keith's generosity made him a beloved feature of our team and of so many people in the private sector and public sector who dealt with him on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis.

We all admired the impressive enthusiasm he brought to his work. I can recall many meetings where Keith would speak so quickly and passionately about an issue that we could hardly keep pace.

A lifelong student of philosophy and a devout Catholic, Keith's earnest energy stems from his belief in the importance of our work in this, the people's House, and in the ethics that ought to guide each of us in this institution.

Through it all, Keith maintained a great sense of humor and never took himself too seriously. He was serious but not serious about himself.

Although I am proud to praise Keith, everyone should know that he is a man of deep humility and perhaps would not want me making this speech on the floor. He is probably squirming in his

seat listening to this, and I hope he is—listening, that is, not squirming.

Nevertheless, he ought to know how much we have appreciated his service. Who better to serve as my adviser on issues facing our Federal workers than a man who himself exemplifies the ideal Federal employee, a man of intellect, a man of integrity, a man of generosity, a man of humor, but a very serious, hardworking, and effective public servant.

Madam Speaker, if Keith is listening, and I hope he is, I thank him for everything he has done for our country and wish him well as he begins this new chapter in an extraordinarily productive career.

Madam Speaker, I bless him and his family, and I wish him Godspeed.

RECOGNIZING MARSHALL RAUCH'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of the 100th birthday of one of North Carolina's greatest statesmen, Marshall Rauch.

Growing up in Gaston County, Marshall Rauch was my State senator. He served 24 years in the State senate, representing Gaston, Cleveland, Lincoln, and Rutherford Counties, all parts of my congressional district.

Prior to that, he was on the Gastonia City Council for 14 years. He was one of the most powerful elected officials in the State, serving as chair of the North Carolina Senate Finance Committee, and that was before our Governor had a veto. His service was also groundbreaking. Senator Rauch was one of the first Jewish elected officials in North Carolina.

But let's back up to where it all started. Marshall Rauch came south from his native New York City to play basketball at Duke University in the 1940s. That was long before anyone had heard of Coach K. In fact, he played for Coach Eddie Cameron in the first year that Duke Indoor Stadium was open, long before that legendary venue would be renamed for Coach Cameron.

Marshall's time at Duke was cut short by World War II, where he served bravely. However, he will always have Duke to thank for meeting his wife of 64 years, Jeanne.

After the war, they settled in Jeanne's native Gaston County, where Marshall started Rauch Industries, thus beginning his prolific business and political career. Rauch Industries in Gastonia grew into a leading manufacturer. I knew it well because I mowed the grass around his facility for a number of years.

Rauch Industries provided jobs to thousands and stood as a pillar of the civic and charitable community in Gaston County, and we are grateful for it.

It was not lost on anyone that this business owned by a leading Jewish cit-

izen was one of the world's leading manufacturers of what, you may ask? Christmas ornaments.

Senator Rauch was recently quoted as saying: “In Judaism, there are eight degrees of charity, and the highest and best charity you can do is to help someone in a manner that they don't need help anymore.”

Senator, you have done that in many ways for lots of people for a number of years, and we are all the better for it.

REMEMBERING WALTER STINE ISENHOWER

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, few people these days associate politicians with humility, but Catawba County in my district benefited from the service of one such person for many decades. Walter Stine Isenhower, known as Mr. Catawba County, passed away in January at the age of 95, and I rise today to honor his legacy and service to our area.

Stine was a lifelong Republican who served as chairman of the Catawba County Board of Commissioners and as a member of the North Carolina House of Representatives.

His impact is still felt in the community from many issues that he championed, including support for the local community college and the county hospital.

Stine was a veteran of the U.S. Army and a volunteer fireman, and he held various leadership roles with his beloved church, Concordia Lutheran.

His favorite saying was that a day out of Catawba County is a day wasted. We thank Stine for devoting his life to making our lives better.

CONGRATULATING THE NAPAVINE TIGERS FOOTBALL TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. PEREZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PEREZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Napavine High School football team for a fabulous season. They have brought home yet another State championship in football.

The Tigers put up an impressive 41 points in one game. The defense stood tall, paying the way to secure the title.

Victories like these really highlight the importance of team sports and competition. These experiences bring communities together and teach students the value of teamwork and hard work.

Congratulations, Napavine Tigers. You have made your community and me very proud for an amazing season.

RECOGNIZING SANDRA BEDROSIAN SERMONE

Ms. PEREZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Sandra Bedrosian Sermone, a resident of my district, for her work on ADNP syndrome, a rare neurodevelopmental disorder.

In 2016, Sandra founded the ADNP Kids Research Foundation after her son was diagnosed with this disorder. Additionally, Sandra helped discover a

new biomarker for the ADNP gene, helping her spearhead efforts to diagnose and cure ADNP.

Through her efforts, the ADNP Kids Research Foundation has donated over \$2 million to studying ADNP syndrome, making it the world's largest contributor to ADNP research.

The foundation is based out of Brush Prairie, Washington, in my district, and I want to take this opportunity to thank Sandra and her entire team for their trailblazing work. I wish them the very best as they endeavor to find a cure for ADNP syndrome.

CELEBRATING LONGVIEW'S CENTENNIAL

Ms. PEREZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the centennial anniversary of Longview, Washington.

Longview was created north of the Columbia River and west of the Cowlitz River in 1923 by the Long-Bell Lumber Company. It was, at the time, the first city of its size created entirely by private funds.

Previously, the Long-Bell Lumber Company was located in Missouri, and I think they judiciously relocated to the Northwest, where timber grows on trees.

Longview was dedicated in 1923 and then incorporated as a municipal government in February 1924. Today, Longview is a thriving community of over 37,000 people. It is a major port hub and continues to be a powerhouse in timber, cardboard, and paper industries.

As part of its celebrations, Longview celebrated a Centennial Kickoff Celebration on January 20. I look forward to celebrating with them throughout the year, particularly during this summer's annual cardboard boat regatta.

CELEBRATING THE MECHA MULES ROBOTICS TEAM

Ms. PEREZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to give a huge shout-out to the Wahkiakum High School Mecha Mules robotics team. Somebody needs to make a movie about these guys. They are phenomenal.

Wahkiakum High School actually did not have hot running water in many of their bathrooms. It is a rural and, in many ways, a very underresourced school.

These kids, ranging in age from eighth grade all the way to seniors, placed second at the International SeaPerch underwater robotics competition. They are doing phenomenal work. They placed 17th out of over a hundred competitors in Washington State's competition.

I was so honored to visit with them last month. These kids really know their stuff. I am behind them 100 percent, so much so that I actually offered or agreed to jump in a pool if they are successful in their next competition. Hopefully, we will have more on that.

Again, congratulations. We are all so proud of you. You have made your community very proud, and I am very excited to see what you all continue to do.

THANKING U.S. COAST GUARD AND COLUMBIA RIVER BAR PILOTS FOR THEIR SERVICE

Ms. PEREZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank the U.S. Coast Guard and Columbia River Bar pilots in southwest Washington for their dedicated service every day on the Columbia River Bar.

This is one of the most dangerous bodies of water in the world. It is where the mighty Columbia meets the Pacific Ocean. In winter, waves reach over 30 feet to 40 feet in height.

Every day, these folks risk their lives to save lives and livelihoods and ensure that the Columbia River can be a connecting route for Washington State and the entire world for trade. I am so grateful for the work they do guiding cargo ships and providing aid to stranded vessels.

□ 1045

RECKLESS SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BICE. Madam Speaker, today the President will release his budget, and I thought it would be appropriate to stand before you to talk about how we got here today.

There has been reckless spending under both Republican and Democratic administrations, but let me be very clear: We do not have a revenue problem. We have a spending problem.

What is truly astonishing is that during the course of this 5-minute speech, the national debt will increase by \$7 million. In the next 10 years, the debt is predicted to almost double.

Furthermore, if the debt were divided evenly, each taxpayer would be responsible for \$246,867 in debt.

We should have heeded the words of George Washington, who said, "... avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts, which unavoidable wars may have occasioned. . . ."

But it is not only George Washington, overall. The Founders generally disapproved of debt and believed that the amount the country owed should be limited.

The U.S. national debt has increased by more than \$8 trillion since late January 2020, the majority of which was under the Biden administration. This includes programs like the American Rescue Plan; the infrastructure legislation, which was really the Green New Deal in disguise; less than half of that funding went to traditional infrastructure; and the so-called Inflation Reduction Act.

We can't continue with the status quo. For FY23, Biden proposed a \$5.8 trillion budget. The national debt is becoming a leading national security concern. Foreign countries, such as China, hold nearly \$870 billion in debt.

It is Biden's executive orders that have led to increased regulations, high-

er inflation and, ultimately, higher national debt. Programs such as the student loan forgiveness program, canceling the Keystone XL pipeline, Waters of the U.S., and other executive orders that have cost Americans nearly \$1 trillion.

The CBO's Budget and Economic Outlook projects a Federal deficit of \$1.4 trillion in 2023, an average of \$2 trillion annually from 2024 to 2033.

The President's budget will double down on failed economic policies that have been devastating for millions of hardworking Americans. It locks in historic levels of spending on far-left policies and higher taxes that will worsen inflation and drive our economy into recession.

President Biden's answer—creating a culture of dependency that makes millions of families more reliant on the government. His approach will mean fewer people in the workforce, more people on welfare, and a stagnant economy for a generation. We are on the brink of an unprecedented fiscal crisis.

Republicans have a strong vision for the country. It is called the Commitment to America. It is built on four main principles: An economy that is strong, a Nation that is safe, a future that is built on freedom, and a government that is accountable.

Meanwhile, the Democrats have their own vision for this country, and it is weaker: An economy that is weak. The administration has significantly constrained economic growth, causing 15 consecutive months of 40-year high inflation. Prices for groceries, gas, and other household necessities have skyrocketed.

They propose raising taxes on individuals, families, and businesses, which will result in even higher prices, lower wages, and fewer jobs.

A nation that is at risk; President Biden's budget fails to prioritize the safety and security of the American people. It fails to adequately fund border security, leaving us vulnerable to crime, gangs, and drugs pouring into the country.

A future that is built on dependency; currently, there are 11 million job openings in America, and 5.7 million unemployed individuals. This partisan agenda traps people in a cycle of poverty and government dependence.

Lastly, a government that is unaccountable. The Democrats' proposed budgets represent a significant expansion of the Federal Government's role in our daily lives. It is essential we hold government accountable for spending and ensure that taxpayer dollars, yours and mine, are being spent wisely.

There are theories that the rich and corporations don't pay their fair share. Businessowners pay taxes in numerous ways, corporate tax, capital gains, income tax. The top 1 percent pay 40 percent Federal income tax already.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LOUIS MATARAZZO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Madam Speaker, I stand before you and this body today to recognize an incredible American, an incredible New Yorker, and an incredible law enforcement professional, Louis Matarazzo.

Lou Matarazzo committed his life to serving the people of New York, where he spent 35 years as a member of the greatest police department in the world, the New York City Police Department.

During his time in the NYPD, Lou experienced the ups and downs of life on patrol as an NYPD cop, dealing with a crime crisis spanning decades. Throughout this tumultuous time, Lou remained a steadfast community protector, an advocate for his fellow brothers and sisters in blue.

For 31 years, Lou served in various capacities in the New York City Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, eventually being elected president in 1995. Throughout his tenure, Lou Matarazzo worked tirelessly to advocate for members of law enforcement, not just in New York, but across this country, and strengthened police community relationships in the Big Apple and beyond.

Due to his efforts, the lives of New York's protectors were enhanced, community relations were improved, and the NYPD transformed into an all-around more effective policing agency.

But Matarazzo didn't stop there. After retiring from the NYPD and giving up his leadership in the PBA, he worked throughout the country to support law enforcement professionals, including on Long Island, and served as a special adviser to my former union, the New York City Detectives' Endowment Association.

Sadly, on February 12 of this year, Lou Matarazzo passed away, leaving behind a loving family and a community in mourning. The Rockville Centre and Fourth Congressional District resident left a lasting positive influence on New York, the United States, and the law enforcement profession throughout this country.

His professionalism, commitment to duty and excellence in policing served as an example to me during my time in the NYPD and helped me rise through the ranks to become a detective.

I will personally miss Lou's leadership, the example he set, and his guiding hand in New York. This good and faithful servant completed his mission and remained our motto, "Fidelis Ad Mortem," faithful until death.

To the Matarazzo family, please know we will never forget the legend that Lou was.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

From generation to generation, You, O Lord, have spoken. With a word You called the world into being. You spoke and creation came to life.

Speak now to us this day, You, from whose mouth came the very law we seek to uphold and defend. Cause Your righteousness to be the framework on which we build our communities, our country, and our Congress.

In a whisper in the whirlwind, guide us when all around us is uncertain, uncivil, and unclear. May we hear Your direction that it would enable us to find certainty, to live civilly, and to discover clarity in the decisions You put before us.

Timeless and timely, Your word remains alive and powerful. May those who lead this country yield themselves to its authority and heed its judgment of their thoughts and the attitudes of their hearts.

Nothing that proceeds from Your mouth will return to You empty without accomplishing what You desire, and without succeeding in the matter for which You spoke. May we hear Your word for us this day that it would give us purpose for our labors.

In Your sovereign name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCGOVERN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the

Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 100

Whereas James T. Broyhill was born in Lenoir, North Carolina, on August 19, 1927, and attended the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill;

Whereas James T. Broyhill served as a prominent civic leader in Lenoir, North Carolina, and served in several roles at the furniture company of his father;

Whereas James T. Broyhill served in the House of Representatives from 1963 to 1986, establishing a reputation for impeccable constituent services;

Whereas, during his distinguished career in the House of Representatives, James T. Broyhill was the leading force behind the creation of the Consumer Product Safety Commission;

Whereas legislation introduced by James T. Broyhill designating the Overmountain Victory National Historic Trail was enacted in September 1980;

Whereas, on June 29, 1986, James T. Broyhill was appointed by the Governor of North Carolina, Jim Martin, to the Senate, where he served until November 4, 1986;

Whereas, after his service in the Senate, James T. Broyhill served as chairman of the North Carolina Economic Development Commission, and then as the Secretary of Commerce of North Carolina before retiring from political life in 1991; and

Whereas the community work of James T. Broyhill included serving as chairman and member of the Appalachian State University Board of Trustees, a member of the Board of Visitors of the Bowman Gray/Baptist Hospital Medical Center, a member of the Board of Visitors of the Babcock Graduate School of Management at Wake Forest University, and a member of the Board of Directors of the North Carolina Food Bank: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate—

(A) has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of James T. Broyhill, former Member of the Senate;

(B) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of James T. Broyhill; and

(2) when the Senate adjourns today, it stands adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late James T. Broyhill.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 26. Joint Resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 724. An act to protect children against sexual abuse and exploitation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 99-591, as amended by Public Law 12-221, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following member of the United States Senate as a Senate Trustee to the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation:

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker).

The message also announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy:

The Senator from Iowa (Ms. Ernst) (At Large).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSE). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

APPRECIATION AND RECOGNITION FOR DREW KENNEDY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to recognize Drew Kennedy for his congressional staff service to the Second District of South Carolina.

Drew has been a valued team member for over 10 years, and both his contributions and presence will be missed. Upon graduating from the University of South Carolina, Drew served constituents at the Midlands' office and then moved to Washington. Drew quickly became an expert in many policy areas, advising on committee issues, preparing legislation, working on markups, and more. His competence earned him the position of deputy chief of staff.

Drew has become a respected leader among his peers and industry leaders. Our loss is the gain of the House Armed Services Committee. Multiple generations of Drew's family are appreciated, with grandparents Jane and Richard Kennedy being founders of the modern Republican majority in South Carolina, with his civic leader parents, Judge Cathy Kennedy and Dr. Attorney Rick Kennedy.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism continues moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America.

NATIONAL SCHOOL BREAKFAST WEEK

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we want America's kids to remain competitive in the 21st century, we can't just teach reading and math. We need to ensure they have healthy, nutritious food in school. Studies show keeping kids fed leads to better attendance, higher test scores, and lifelong benefits.

Last summer, Congress temporarily increased the Federal reimbursement

level schools receive for breakfast and lunch, but in the richest country in the history of the world, we can do better. This National School Breakfast Week I have introduced the Healthy Meals Help Kids Learn Act to permanently increase the reimbursement level for our children.

The next generation of Americans—our future doctors, engineers, carpenters, professors, mechanics, and more—need nutritious food to learn and to thrive. If we pass my bill, schools can make more made-from-scratch meals with more locally sourced, healthier ingredients.

It is a win-win-win for our kids, our farmers, and our future. I urge strong bipartisan support for my bill.

HONORING THE YOUNG LIFE OF DAVID JOHN CHASE

(Mr. VAN ORDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life of an exceptional young man, David John Chase of La Crosse, Wisconsin.

David passed away November 1 of last year at the age of 15 after a courageous 10-month battle with an aggressive form of brain cancer for which there was no cure.

Despite facing a tremendous battle, David displayed courage and compassion far beyond his years. In the midst of battling this incurable brain cancer, David was far more concerned about his family and how they were impacted by his diagnosis.

David's selflessness and care for others around him was a constant presence throughout his life. He volunteered his time at Immanuel Lutheran Church in La Crosse, Wisconsin, and hoped one day to serve in the United States military and later have a career in construction. He wanted to work with his hands and he wanted to build America. He knew at his young age that this is what he wanted to do.

Most of all, David loved his family. One of his favorite memories was hunting deer in Ettrick, Wisconsin, with his dad.

David leaves behind a legacy of bravery, selflessness, and love.

I extend my deepest condolences to David's family—his parents, Jennifer and Abraham; his grandmother, Diane, who is here in the House gallery; and his brother, Landyn, who was David's caretaker and is with his grandmother today in the gallery.

God bless David and his family, and God bless the United States of America. We will miss this young man.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO GARY WASSERSON

(Ms. WILD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a fellow Pennsylvanian,

Gary Wasserson, of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

A little over a year ago following the beginning of Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, Gary found out that he had distant cousins in Lviv. That realization prompted him to act, and soon he was on the Poland-Ukraine border assembling a team to cross the border and bring his relatives to safety.

Gary didn't stop there.

He has helped build an entire support network coming to the aid of Ukrainians in need: assisting in the successful extraction of thousands of Ukrainians to safe havens in Poland, Slovakia, Moldova, and across Western Europe; and sending hundreds of thousands of pounds of needed aid into Ukraine. Gary recently brought a gravely injured Ukrainian soldier to the Hospital for Special Surgery in New York City where he was able to receive the complex medical procedures that he urgently needed.

These are just a few examples of the profound difference that Gary, a private citizen, is making.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Gary for his compassion, for his willingness to act, and his dedication to standing with the Ukrainian people as they continue to resist this horrific war of aggression.

REPUBLICANS PRIORITIZE POLITICAL STUNTS

(Ms. BROWNLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, while working families are facing economic challenges, House Republicans continue to prioritize political stunts.

This week, Republicans have taken to the House floor to support efforts that disseminate extreme MAGA conspiracy theories and encourage the spread of foreign propaganda and harmful online content that undermine our democracy.

House Republicans are also using committee hearings to dehumanize the LGBTQ community—promoting hateful and dangerous rhetoric.

House Democrats will always put people over politics, and we continue to work to build on the economic gains we have made over the last 2 years.

House Democrats continue to work to lower costs and invest in America—all while reducing the Federal deficit.

It is past time for House Republicans to stop playing the politics of demonization and work for the American people and work for their interests.

ADD SOY

(Mr. CARTER of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of my ADD SOY Act. This bill makes soy milk available to children who need alternatives to cow's milk. This is especially important for the large number

of minority children who are lactose intolerant and experience adverse health effects simply because, in practice, dairy is the only type of milk offered in schools.

The rates of lactose intolerance in these communities is surprisingly high with 65 percent of Latino students, 75 percent of Black students, and 90 percent of Asian students unable to digest dairy milk without detrimental effects.

Many children don't make the connection between consumption of this product and their feelings of discomfort and even illness. Right now, children who suffer adverse reactions from cow's milk must get a doctor's note if they choose not to accept traditional milk in their lunch. This is partly due to Congress' "milk note" requirement which places an unfair burden squarely on minority children.

Lactose intolerance causes a range of health effects, from stomach pains and digestive problems to exacerbated asthma symptoms. This makes learning more difficult for children.

America needs to embrace a diverse lunch counter solution.

PROTECTING SPEECH FROM GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILSON of South Carolina). Pursuant to House Resolution 199 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 140.

Will the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI) kindly take the chair.

□ 1212

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 140) to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit Federal employees from advocating for censorship of viewpoints in their official capacity, and for other purposes, with Mr. AMODEI (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 8, 2023, amendment No. 6, printed in House Report 118-7 offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. ROSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 118-7.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, after line 16, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent subsections):

“(e) ANNUAL TRAINING.—Not less than annually, the head of each employing agency shall provide mandatory training on this section and the requirements of this section to each agency employee.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution No. 199, the gentleman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment designated as Amendment No. 9 to H.R. 140, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act, and I thank my friend from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) for introducing this important piece of legislation.

Federal employees should absolutely not be censoring lawful speech, and I am proud to support this bill which will clearly prohibit that practice.

My straightforward amendment simply requires mandatory annual training on the requirements of the underlying bill. We were all recently made aware of the shameful instances of Federal Government-driven censorship that occurred in conjunction with Twitter over the last several years, and with that revelation, we must be suspicious that similar censorship has occurred in conjunction with other Big Tech social media platforms.

The goal of H.R. 140 is to eliminate such instances of Federal Government censorship, and my amendment furthers that goal by requiring Federal employees to undergo annual training to inform and remind them of their obligations under this bill to refrain from any and all censorship activities.

□ 1215

Kara Frederick, director of The Heritage Foundation's Tech Policy Center, recently penned a Heritage Foundation backgrounder titled: “Combating Big Tech's Totalitarianism: A Road Map.”

In her piece, Ms. Frederick writes: “The Biden administration is attempting to circumvent the Constitution by pressuring private tech companies to take down content under a broad and politically biased definition of misinformation. When Big Tech companies do the government's bidding by removing users and content that the government tells them are objectionable, they are essentially acting as government agents, a potential violation of the First Amendment.”

Mr. Chair, I am proud that this Congress has made this bill a priority. Government censorship and government-pressured censorship of lawful speech are just plain wrong.

Today, we are pushing back on this anti-freedom activity. My amendment will strengthen H.R. 140 by helping to ensure a high level of compliance with its requirements.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which

is, as the gentleman has described, a simple training requirement to ensure that this act is implemented correctly. Seems like a perfectly reasonable thing in and of itself; that is, it would be if the actual underlying bill that it seeks to modify was reasonable and not some sort of bizarre, Orwellian doublespeak designed to mislead the American people about what this bill is actually about.

Nothing about this bill is reasonable. Nothing about this bill, the process of how it has been brought to the floor, and how it has misled the people of our country about what is happening is normal. It does not secure the freedom of speech or any other freedoms of the American people. It actually endangers them.

In fact, it imperils our democracy by handcuffing the ability of law enforcement, national security, and intelligence officials to provide factual, critical information to social media companies and the public in order to prevent crimes or to ensure that election fraud tampering does not occur and that there is no foreign interference with our elections.

This is not some unintended consequence of the bill; rather, it is the entire point of this bill, as my Republican colleagues have conceded.

When we marked up this bill in the Oversight Committee, Chairman COMER produced two emails from a single FBI agent to Twitter that he said were “the purpose of the bill.” You might be asking, what terrible censorship was the FBI trying to achieve in those emails? When Democrats were finally provided with the email content, it was an email to Twitter from the FBI identifying fraudulent election tweets. In fact, the content identified that there were multiple tweets that were misleading about the time, place, or manner of voting in the upcoming election.

This is the smoking gun that they are claiming is taking away our freedoms—that is right—election misinformation that was meant to deceive American voters, which the FBI flagged as part of their course of business. They would like to hamper the ability of our FBI and our law enforcement to be able to do their jobs.

This is, of course, the same party that has engaged in voter suppression for countless decades, so we probably shouldn't be surprised.

We know that the American people not only want us to protect their voting rights and their basic rights to express themselves, their freedoms as protected by the Bill of Rights and our Constitution, but we also want our public servants to be able to do their jobs and to do their jobs with integrity and ensure the integrity of our election system.

Democrats sought to try to address some of the grave flaws in this bill and address the supposed intent of the bill by submitting 43 separate amendments for floor consideration. In fact, only one was made in order.

Republicans, on the other hand, submitted 20 amendments, many like this one, ignoring the dangers of the underlying bill and not wanting to improve it to protect American freedoms but simply tinker around the edges to make it more enforceable.

My question is, why are we voting on this amendment and not Congressman TORRES' amendment to ensure the bill does not prohibit Federal officials from preventing and addressing cyberattacks?

Why are we voting on this amendment and not Congressman LYNCH's amendment to ensure the bill does not prohibit Federal officials from protecting our national security?

Why are we voting on this amendment and not Congressman GOLDMAN's amendment to ensure that the bill does not prohibit Federal officials from fighting foreign election interference, as occurred in the 2016 election?

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and oppose this bill. It does nothing to improve a deeply dangerous bill.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, when it comes to censorship or pressured censorship by Federal Government employees, ignorance is not bliss. My amendment seeks to further the anti-censorship goals of H.R. 140 by requiring mandatory education for Federal employees on the bill's new anti-censorship requirements.

Therefore, because of my amendment, Federal employees will not be able to claim ignorance of the new requirements we are implementing in the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to vote "yes" on my amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chair, I will take a moment to reiterate that this bill is not as it appears or the majority is proposing it appears to the American public.

This bill is not about defending the basic right to free speech and our constitutional rights. This bill is about hamstringing the ability of Federal law enforcement, our national security staff, and others in the Federal Government from protecting our country from election interference.

This amendment would make the enforcement of that bill stronger by requiring training to further censor and allow for interference in our elections.

I am opposed to this amendment, and I rise in opposition to the bill.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. ROSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 118-7.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following new section:
SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that inspectors general should not less than annually for the next seven years publicly report the number of complaints and tips received, the number of investigations opened, and statistics on how investigations were managed and their disposition by that inspector general related to compliance with this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment designated as amendment No. 10 to H.R. 140, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act.

Mr. Chair, I sincerely hope that after H.R. 140 is enacted, there are zero violations of the bill's new anti-censorship requirements. However, if any violation or allegations of violations do occur, then the public has a right to know.

My amendment is simple. It states that it is the sense of Congress that inspectors general should publicly report the number of complaints and tips received, the number of investigations opened, and statistics on how investigations were managed and their disposition by the inspector general related to compliance with the underlying bill.

The amendment specifies that the inspectors general should publicly report no less than annually. The amendment also sunsets after 7 years.

Whether or not my colleagues on the other side of the aisle support the underlying Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act, I hope they will support this amendment as it is vital that the public have an accurate picture of whether the laws that Congress passes are being followed.

Public reporting of the number of tips and complaints received and statistics on investigations related to compliance with H.R. 140 is a pro-transparency measure to hold the government accountable that I hope we all can support.

This amendment is a commonsense and gentle nudge to inspectors general that it is the sense of this body that public reporting related to compliance with this bill is an important endeavor.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chair, our inspectors general conduct vital work on behalf of the American people. They help to safeguard taxpayer dollars and government operations from waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement, and they investigate what occurs inside our Federal agencies. To ask them to waste their finite resources and staffing on an annual reporting requirement for a bill that actually threatens the freedom of the American people and the American public and electoral system is gravely antithetical to their missions and their purpose and is, itself, an act of waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement. Nobody could act in good conscience to support this amendment.

One of the most concerning aspects of this bill is that it creates a waiting period of at least 72 hours before law enforcement officials can take action to prevent or respond to most crimes or threats they identify, either on or involving social media platforms.

Let's imagine that you are a Federal official, an FBI investigator, and you see information being shared online that indicates that a sexual assault is imminent, some sort of violence is about to occur, there is some sort of election fraud about to occur. Under this bill, you would have a decision to make. Do you write and file a lengthy report to Congress and then wait 72 hours until it is too late, or do you act immediately, knowing that you might be subject to a \$50,000 fine or might be barred from Federal service for 10 years because you reported something that has been tagged as censored speech under this bill and amendment?

Thanks to the excellent bipartisan work of Congresswoman HOULAHAN and Congresswoman MACE, we could have been considering a very different kind of amendment here on the floor today, one that would have made sure that this bill still allowed enforcement officials to act immediately in this exact case.

□ 1230

My Republican colleagues would not allow this amendment to come to the floor today, choosing, instead, to waste our time and the time and resources of our Federal agencies on this amendment. They choose a do-nothing, wasteful reporting requirement over a bipartisan amendment that would protect the safety, in many instances, even the lives, of women and Americans across the country. It is outrageous.

I believe that this bill and this amendment are dangerous, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chair, in closing, I will note one final time that this bill and its proposition are deeply dangerous. It proposes to actually address

free speech and censorship when, in fact, it would hamstring our Federal officials.

This amendment adds dangerous changes to the bill that would make it even more difficult for our Federal officials to do their job.

I am opposed to the amendment, and I am strongly opposed to the bill itself.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

By voting "yes" on Amendment 10, Members are reaffirming their commitment to transparency and government accountability. If my amendment passes, along with the underlying bill, the American people will be more well-informed of violations of the underlying bill.

In closing, I urge Members to vote "yes" on my amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chair, I think we have well established that not only the premise of this bill, but many of the requirements in it, are dangerous for our Federal law enforcement, dangerous to our constitutional rights, dangerous to the American people, and dangerous to our national security and our electoral system.

Yet, the way it is being proposed to the American people is that it will defend their rights and their rights to speak freely under the First Amendment.

During our markup of this bill, we talked about gaslighting. Gaslighting is the act of when somebody in authority actually makes you believe you are crazy because the truth of what is occurring is actually the opposite.

This bill is a dangerous gaslighting of the American people. We will not stand for it. It is dangerous to our democracy. It is dangerous to our elections, and it is dangerous for the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ROUZER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROUZER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 140) to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit Federal employees from advocating for censorship of viewpoints in their official capacity, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 199, he

reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Landsman of Ohio moves to recommit the bill H.R. 140 to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 199, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 27

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in

Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'" (88 Fed. Reg. 3004 (January 18, 2023)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 27.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of H.J. Res. 27, which I introduced, to negate an ill-timed and ill-conceived rule coming out of the Biden administration which, if Congress fails to act, will go into effect later this month.

The Clean Water Act is landmark legislation that was signed into law 50 years ago that has greatly improved the health of the Nation's waters.

Unfortunately, we have consistently seen increasingly expansive interpretations of the Clean Water Act result in the implementation of a flawed and overreaching water policy. This has hindered our ability to achieve the Clean Water Act's true underlying water quality goals.

There is no clearer example of this overreach than the debate over the definition of waters of the United States, or WOTUS.

Decades of agency interpretation and misinterpretations have created uncertainty for rural communities, for farmers, for ranchers, for businesses and industries who rely on clean water.

Although the 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule finally provided long-awaited clarity on the scope of WOTUS, the new administration decided to unravel the water protection rule and attempt to replace it, once again, creating confusion and chaos.

The definition of WOTUS matters to the everyday lives of people all over the country, including in my district.

For instance, I have a constituent who wanted to build a pond on his property and had received local and State permits to do just that. But then the Army Corps of Engineers, they stepped in and they said he would have

to spend \$165,000 in environmental mitigation. This is absolutely outrageous.

Returning to a more costly, burdensome, and broad WOTUS definition could have a massive impact on local communities and Americans' ability to do their jobs and manage their own private property.

I urge support of this joint resolution to stop this burdensome and overreaching WOTUS rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Clean water is a human right, and the health and safety of our communities and the success of our economy depend upon it.

House Democrats stand for clean water, and today, I rise to oppose H.J. Res. 27.

Last Congress, we passed a bipartisan, once-in-a-generation investment in our Nation's infrastructure through the bipartisan infrastructure law, investing almost \$13 billion in clean water infrastructure upgrades and creating jobs in communities across this country.

The BIL showed what Congress can do when we focus on the needs of American families. Yet, instead of putting people over pollution, this CRA does the opposite.

Now, my State of Washington is defined by its clean water, including the health of the Puget Sound and the hundreds of lakes and thousands of miles of rivers and streams throughout the State.

My constituents know that rivers, streams, and wetlands, are intrinsically connected. Pollution that starts in one body of water does not stay put.

House Democrats believe we can protect clean water, while providing certainty to businesses, to farmers, to Americans who depend upon clean water for their lives and livelihoods.

This is especially true for the 117 million Americans who depend on smaller streams as a source of their drinking water at a time when many States are facing historic droughts.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they want clean water rules that are simple, clear and easy to follow. I want that, too.

The Biden administration's Clean Water Restoration Rule does exactly that; following the law and the science of protecting clean water and providing regulatory certainty and stability to the implementation of the Clean Water Act.

This resolution does the opposite. This resolution will not bring back the previous administration's Navigable Waters Protection Rule, which removed Federal protections on roughly half of the Nation's wetlands and 70 percent of its rivers and streams.

That rule was rightly rejected by a Federal court in 2021, as "fundamentally flawed" and likely to cause "seri-

ous environmental harm" every day it remained in effect. It is off the table entirely.

This resolution before us today will also not eliminate the use of the "significant nexus" test because that test was mandated by the U.S. Supreme Court. It has been in effect since the Bush administration and remains in place today.

□ 1245

However, this resolution will adversely impact farmers, ranchers, and developers by creating regulatory chaos and eliminating important exclusions that have been codified in the new rule to help water-dependent businesses and farmers to understand and comply with the law.

Now, despite fear-mongering on this issue, the truth is simple. The Biden proposal will have no impact on the average family farmer in this country. Why? That is because farmers are, by law, largely exempt from the Clean Water Act permitting requirements where less than 1 percent of all annual wetlands permits relate to agricultural activities nationwide.

Therefore, if your farm is engaged in normal farming, forestry, and ranching activity, or undertakes the construction or maintenance of a farm, stock pond, or irrigation ditch, you are exempt from the permitting requirements of the act, and the current proposal does not change that exemption.

Finally, for those waiting to see whether the Supreme Court will somehow fix this issue in the upcoming Sackett case, this resolution will actually hinder the ability of the Corps and the EPA to respond to the Supreme Court's potential recommendations later this year.

That is why this resolution before us makes no sense. It would invalidate the Biden rule and all the clarifications and exceptions for business it contains in favor of a similarly structured but much less clear regulatory framework. That is a recipe for uncertainty, legal battles, and continued gridlock, the opposite of what proponents say they are looking for. It would also tie the hands of Federal agencies seeking to help individuals comply with the law, unless Congress acts again.

This shortsighted action will lessen, not increase, certainty. It is a big mistake. I support the administration's efforts to efficiently implement the critical water infrastructure investments included in the BIL so we can begin to realize the public health, economic, and environmental benefits that come with clean water.

This resolution represents a giant step backward for clean water, increases uncertainty for farmers, homebuilders, roadbuilders, and all American families, and doubles down on the infighting and chaos.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.J. Res. 27 and move together toward a future with predictability for those that need it and clean

water for communities that cannot survive without it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), the cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I will note that you are exempt until you are not exempt.

I rise in support of H.J. Res. 27. This is a very important and crucial resolution that we pass. There is no greater example of bureaucratic overreach under the Clean Water Act than the longstanding regulatory ordeal of understanding and complying with the definition of "waters of the United States," or WOTUS, as we call it.

Despite the benefits of the Clean Water Act, its history has been wrought with the tortured past stemming from regulatory headaches and overreach from bureaucrats, all because Congress never defined what a "navigable water" is. Many times, this combination has led to uncertainty for individuals and the more formally regulated communities.

The reality is, this resolution is only necessary because of the Biden administration's decision to publish a new definition of "waters of the United States" under the Clean Water Act. It is very important that Congress ensures this overreaching definition has no force.

Now, in my mind, regulations should carry out the intent of the law in a simple, easily understood, and transparent manner, leaving no wiggle room for any bureaucrat to substitute their own biases and hijack the process. Unfortunately, that is not the case with this new WOTUS rule.

Put simply, this rule is the equivalent of a nuclear warhead aimed right at our farmers, communities, homebuilders, roadbuilders, and private property owners, among many others. The ramifications of its implementation will be far and wide, affecting the prosperity and economic opportunity of all Americans. As of March 20, that nuclear warhead is going to be launched.

Once the Federal Government has complete control over the definition of a "water," because of an arbitrary and ambiguous definition, it will then have control over everything else that is applied to the land, whether it be application of pesticides or herbicides or the building of a fence or a shed or anything else.

A farmer, homeowner, or any other property owner could be prosecuted for these simple and customary actions because a bureaucrat decides that what they have done affects a "navigable water."

So let's be clear. Ambiguity and subjectivity enshrined by an environmental rule are no friends of freedom, the production of food or other goods, or prosperity.

Despite what supporters of the Biden WOTUS rule say, it will do nothing to

bring forth certainty and consistency, except for the trial lawyers and radical environmentalists who are most certainly consistent and persistent in their work to use the executive and judicial branches of government to essentially halt the work of, and extort from, those who produce.

I am proud to cosponsor and support this legislation, Mr. Speaker. I encourage my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud daughter of New Mexico, as a water resources professional, and as a defender of the most basic element that we need to survive, which is water.

In New Mexico, water is life, water is sacred, water is culture, and water is fundamental to everything that we do and everything that we are.

For years, our State and our country and our communities have ridden the roller coaster of regulatory rollbacks on the Clean Water Act, but I never could have imagined that in the year 2023, we would be voting on a bill to gut the rule that protects our streams and rivers and our right to have clean water.

In 2023, just weeks ago, a train derailment in East Palestine sent toxic smoke into the atmosphere, and people were afraid to turn on their taps and drink the water. The American people want clean water. Yet, here we are, weeks later, being forced to take a vote on a bill that would gut a fundamental rule in how the Clean Water Act actually saves our lives.

Water is the most basic element for how we survive as a species. The Clean Water Act was passed because rivers were on fire. In fact, in some of the districts of our Members—who are actually sponsoring this bill—toxic waste and sewage was filling the waterways of these very districts, where children were being poisoned by toxins that were being put in the rivers. Yet, here we are voting for a measure that would leave massive swaths of our waterways exposed, particularly in New Mexico. We are talking about raw sewage, farm waste, and chemicals being dumped in our arroyos and our wetlands.

Let me ask the American people: Is this what you want this body to be working on, gutting the most basic foundation of the protection of our public health and our environment? No, the American people want clean water. They want us to protect our streams and rivers. They want us to protect our farmers and ranchers. They want us to protect their families and their children.

We cannot go back decades, as this measure would take us back, and we cannot gut this fundamental, underlying environmental law that protects the health and safety of our communities.

So wherever you live, whoever you represent, whatever you fight for, know what this bill is actually about.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote with clean water and vote against this measure.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), the chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to repeal the Biden administration's waters of the United States rule.

Since President Biden was sworn into office, the regulatory actions of his administration have cost the private sector nearly \$360 billion in compliance costs and an estimated 220 million man-hours in new paperwork requirements. Later this month, when this rule is finalized, these numbers will get even higher.

Yesterday, the Committee on Small Business held a hearing to speak directly with the people who are going to be affected by this damaging regulation. We heard from Ms. Katherine English of Florida, who became a water attorney to ensure her family farm that has been in operation for over 100 years, could continue to thrive. She told us that this rule is so complicated that she will not know if even simple land adjustments on her own private property would open her up to fines from the Federal Government.

We also heard from Mr. Frank Murphy, from the great State of Texas, who develops real estate. He shared that this new rule will cause him to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in redundant environmental reviews and could delay many projects indefinitely.

For any business, certainty is key, and unfortunately, this rule is leaving many people in the dark on if they will be in compliance with the new regulations.

I support this resolution because it is giving a voice to the small businesses that have been ignored by the unelected bureaucrats at the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers. That is why this resolution is supported by over 100 business groups. Congress must act and listen to the voices of Main Street America on how this regulation will kill jobs and damage the American economy.

In God we trust.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of 91 organizations in opposition to H.J. Res. 27 and an open letter to Congress from the Environmental Protection Network in opposition to H.J. Res. 27.

ORGANIZATIONS IN OPPOSITION TO H.J. RES. 27, RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL OF BIDEN CLEAN WATER RESTORATION RULE

350.org, A Community Voice, Alabama Rivers Alliance, Alaska Community Action on Toxics, Alliance for the Great Lakes, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, American Geophysical Union, American Public Health Association, American Rivers, American Sustainable Business Network,

Amigos Bravos, Anthropocene Alliance, Appalachian Trail Conservancy, Asociación de Residentes de La Margaita, Inc., Atchafalaya Basinkeeper, Black Millennials 4 Flint, Cahaba River Society, California Environmental Voters, Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Environmental Transformation, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Children's Environmental Health Network, Clean Water Action.

Clean, Healthy, Educated, Safe & Sustainable Community, Inc., Coalition for Wetlands and Forests, Committee on the Middle Fork Vermilion River, Community In-Power and Development Association Inc. (CIDA Inc.), Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety, Concerned Citizens of Cook County (Georgia), Conservation Alabama, Earthjustice, Environment America, Environment Texas, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Environmental Working Group, For Love of Water (FLOW), FreshWater Accountability Project, Freshwater Future, Friends of Buckingham, Friends of the Mississippi River, Gila Resources Information Project, Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance, Greater Neighborhood Alliance of Jersey City, NJ, GreenLatinos, Groundswell Charleston SC.

Gullah/Geechee Sea Island Coalition, Healthy Gulf, Hispanic Federation, Idaho Rivers United, Illinois Council of Trout Unlimited, Izaak Walton League of America, Lake Pepin Legacy Alliance, Lawyers for Good Government (L4GG), League of Conservation Voters, Lynn Canal Conservation, Maine Conservation Voters, Malach Consulting, Michigan League of Conservation Voters, Milton's Concerned Citizens, Mississippi River Collaborative, Missouri Confluence Waterkeeper, Montana Conservation Voters, MS Communities United for Prosperity (MCUP), National Parks Conservation Association, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Heritage Institute, Natural Resources Defense Council, NC League of Conservation Voters.

New Mexico Climate Justice, New Mexico Environmental Law Center, New York League of Conservation Voters, Northeastern Minnesotans for Wilderness, Ohio River Foundation, Patagonia Area Resource Alliance, PES, Rapid Creek Watershed Action, Renewal of Life Trust, River Network, Save the Illinois River, Inc., STIR, Serene Wildlife Sanctuary LLC, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Surfrider Foundation, The Clinch Coalition, The Water Collaborative of Greater New Orleans, Tookany/Tacony-Frankford Watershed Partnership, Virginia League of Conservation Voters, Washington Conservation Action, Waterkeepers Chesapeake, Weequahic Park Association, Winyah Rivers Alliance.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION NETWORK,

March 2, 2023.

OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS ON CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF THE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES RULE

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As alumni of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), we are writing to share our perspectives on congressional review of the Clean Water Act "Waters of the United States" rule. The Environmental Protection Network (EPN) taps the bipartisan expertise of more than 550 former EPA staff who volunteer their unique perspectives as scientists and former regulators, permit issuers, and grant providers with decades of historical knowledge and subject matter expertise.

A CONSTRUCTIVE FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING EPA RULES USING THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Congress has an important responsibility to ensure that EPA and other federal agencies are faithful to congressional intent

when issuing rules. Congress' congressional review responsibilities are laid out in law, commonly referred to as the "Congressional Review Act" (CRA).

Rulemaking, when done appropriately, is a methodical process built upon deep understanding of complex and technical information and informed by a wide range of stakeholders with different perspectives. The bipartisan drafters of the CRA recognized the vital roles agencies play in implementing laws, and they strove to strike a balance between "reclaiming for Congress some of its policymaking authority, without at the same time requiring Congress to become a super regulatory agency."

The drafters of the CRA shined a light on how to navigate this balance, recommending that Congress intervene where rules are "surprisingly different from the expectations of Congress or the public."

In addition to avoiding taking on the role of "super regulatory agency," Congress must consider the full ramifications of a resolution of disapproval, which prohibits agencies from taking substantially similar action. The CRA acts like a sledgehammer, not a scalpel. A CRA disapproval resolution can leave a chaotic tangle of regulatory uncertainty and confusion in its wake, resulting in significant harm to the public, regulated entities, and the environment. According to the Congressional Research Service, Congressional disapproval:

"creates uncertainty and could restrict the agency's ability to act going forward. This can potentially create a difficult situation for an agency if Congress uses the CRA to disapprove rules that were specifically required by law . . ."

Historically, members of Congress from both parties have cited the "bluntness" of the CRA tool as the reason they rejected congressional disapproval even when they did not agree with the underlying rule.

EPN suggests a constructive framework of four key questions that Congress should consider when determining whether a rule is "surprisingly different from the expectations of Congress," without venturing into the territory of becoming a "super regulatory agency":

1. Follow the Law: Did the agency follow the law, as directed by Congress and the courts?
2. Follow the Science: Did the agency follow the science, including adequately explaining its factual basis and reasoning?
3. Listen to Stakeholders: Did the agency meaningfully engage with and respond to all major stakeholders, taking different perspectives meaningfully into account?
4. Do No Harm: Would congressional disapproval worsen or improve outcomes for public health, the environment, and stakeholders, including regulated entities?

In pursuing this framework, members of Congress can provide meaningful oversight of actions, while minimizing the harm created by the CRA. In today's climate, with cyclical swings of the political pendulum, there is already significant regulatory whiplash and chaos. Congress should do everything in its power to lessen this confusion, not add to it.

APPLYING THE FRAMEWORK TO THE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES RULE

EPN believes that Congress should support the "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'" rule published by EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers on January 18, 2023. This rule protects waters that are critical to the health and welfare of the American people. The rule is not "surprisingly different from the expectations of Congress or the public." In fact, the rule conforms to the Supreme Court's instructions and largely re-

verts to the long-existing rule that pre-dates the regulatory confusion that has prevailed for too long.

Further, a congressional resolution of disapproval in this case risks a prolonged and perhaps permanent state of regulatory confusion that will create more uncertainty for landowners and others who deserve clear answers on how to comply with the Clean Water Act.

A thoughtful exploration of the four framing CRA questions we pose above will demonstrate that EPA has in fact done its job and done it well.

(1) EPA Followed the Law: The rule is consistent with the objectives of the federal Clean Water Act to "restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters," which are largely interconnected and which flow over and between state lines. The agencies are interpreting "waters of the United States" to mean the waters defined by the familiar pre-2015 regulations, with amendments to reflect the agencies' determination of the statutory limits on the scope informed by Supreme Court precedent, the best available science, and the agencies' experience and technical expertise. In response to both the case law and the science, the 2023 rule only includes upstream waters and wetlands as waters of the U.S. when they significantly affect the integrity of waters for which federal interest is indisputable (traditional navigable waters, territorial seas, and interstate waters).

EPA has also clearly recognized Supreme Court precedent, which, of course, could change with the expected decision in *Sackett v. United States*.

(2) EPA Followed the Science: The agency incorporates well-established science and protects waters that are critical to the health and welfare of the American people, particularly given the extreme weather challenges from climate change and the disproportionate impact on environmental justice communities. For the first time, the 2023 rule provides a detailed definition of the functions that must be assessed and the specific factors that must be considered in determining whether a water has a significant nexus to a water for which federal interest is indisputable. This definition is well supported by scientific evidence and is consistent with the factors the Supreme Court recently identified as critical for determining whether a discharge is jurisdictional in *Country of Maui, Hawaii v. Hawaii Wildlife Fund*.

(3) EPA Responded to Stakeholders Concerns: EPA is to be commended on a particularly thorough and far-reaching stakeholder engagement process, ultimately choosing a middle road that supports public health, environmental protection, agricultural activity, and economic growth. It covers less than the Obama administration proposed in 2015 but more than the Trump administration's rule. The agency conducted regional roundtables throughout the country, as well as solicited input from small businesses, tribes, and the public through multiple channels. In response to farmers concerns, the 2023 rule expands the number of waters exempted from CWA jurisdiction, exempting certain types of ditches, irrigated areas, farm ponds, and water-filled depressions in dry land, and erosional features such as gullies and rills.

(4) Congressional Disapproval Would Create a Chaotic Mess: A congressional vote of disapproval would create prolonged uncertainty and confusion for stakeholders that need to know what waters are protected by the Clean Water Act. Such an action would also endanger the drinking water, fisheries, and flood control for communities throughout the nation.

Congress should support this rulemaking process as it moves through the courts, and refrain from adding more confusion to the situation. Allowing EPA and the Army Corps to complete their job as defined in the law and overseen by the courts will create the kind of clarity stakeholders need.

We are happy to make EPN experts available to you to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

MICHELLE ROOS,
Executive Director,
Environmental Protection Network.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the ranking member of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this resolution of disapproval.

Clean water was not always a partisan issue, and no issue has more support among American families than the protection of our Nation's waters. Now is the worst time to lower our guard on protecting clean water as over half of the United States is experiencing drought conditions. Even though we have had rain, we are still in drought conditions. We need to be doing everything to ensure our cities, our businesses, and our farmers have sufficient, safe, and sustainable supplies of water to meet our economic and agricultural needs, our quality-of-life needs, and our day-to-day survival.

This is especially true in my home State of California. As the Metropolitan Water District, the biggest in the area, commented at our subcommittee last month, the definition of WOTUS is central to the Clean Water Act's implementation and has significant implications for water agencies' day-to-day operations and for water source protection efforts.

That is why I support the efforts of the Biden administration to permanently repeal the previous administration's dirty water rule, a rule that eliminated Federal protections on a minimum of 75 percent of streams and wetlands that have been protected by the act since its inception.

These waters and the wetlands are critical to capturing and storing rain and snowmelt to ensure the long-term supply of water and recharge our underground water aquifers.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand how this resolution, which seeks to undermine and confuse agency efforts to protect our clean water, makes any sense to my constituents who are already making sacrifices to protect our local waters.

This resolution would increase levels of pollution in our waterbodies, increase risk of downstream flooding, and make it harder for communities like mine to maintain sustainable sources of drinking water.

Worst of all, hardworking American families would have to pay for the horrible impacts of this resolution. The Biden rule provided the best available

option to balance the need for protection of waters with the desire for familiarity and workability within the constraints of the law and interpretations of the Supreme Court. This resolution achieves none of those outcomes and is only more likely to make it worse, not better.

Mr. Speaker, I very strongly oppose the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy from the Executive Office of the President on H.J. Res. 27, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States.'"

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.J. RES. 27—PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "REVISED DEFINITION OF 'WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES'"—REP. GRAVES, R-MO, AND 170 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes passage of H.J. Res. 27, a joint resolution to disapprove "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'" ("final rule"). The final rule's definition of "waters of the United States" carefully sets the bounds for what activities are regulated by the federal government under the Clean Water Act. The final rule provides clear rules of the road that will help advance infrastructure projects, economic investments, and agricultural activities—all while protecting water quality. The rule reestablishes critical protections for the nation's vital water resources by returning to the longstanding 1986 regulations with appropriate updates, exclusions, and streamlining clarifications. This pre-2015 approach to "waters of the United States" provides regulatory certainty and reflects the agencies' long experience, the best available science, and extensive stakeholder engagement. In comparison, H.J. Res. 27 would leave Americans without a clear "waters of the United States" definition. The increased uncertainty would threaten economic growth, including for agriculture, local economies, and downstream communities. Farmers would be left wondering whether artificially irrigated areas remain exempt or not. Construction crews would be left wondering whether their waterfilled gravel pits remain exempt or not. Compared to the kind of uncertain, fragmented, and watered-down regulatory system that H.J. Res. 27 might compel, the final rule will secure substantial and valuable benefits each year in critical flood protections, enhanced water quality, and the treasured recreational activities—fishing, swimming, boating, and more—that fill the lives and livelihoods of tens of millions of U.S. households that depend on healthy wetlands and streams.

If Congress were to pass H.J. Res. 27, the President would veto it.

□ 1300

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against the Biden ad-

ministration's extreme overreach with the confusing new waters of the United States rule published by the EPA. This rule removes protections put in place by the previous administration that would protect farmers, ranchers, and small business owners from potential fines and even jail time for carrying out common practices they have done for years.

The men and women who feed America should not have to apply for permits to simply remove debris from a ditch on their property or change the types of crops that they grow in a field. Yet, this is what people in my district in Arkansas and around the country will face under the new WOTUS rule.

To top it all off, this rule is unclear, forcing landowners to hire additional help just to ensure that they are complying with this ill-conceived rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand up to the EPA and vote to block this burdensome rule.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. SYKES).

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 27, which would nullify the rule titled: "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States.'"

As the vice ranking member of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, I am extremely aware of the crucial role clean water plays in the success of our Nation's economy, including agriculture and energy development, as well as the health of our communities.

This resolution is the latest attempt to attack longstanding critical safeguards for clean water with an utter disregard for the devastating impact this will have on hardworking American families.

In Ohio, we have had to bear the brunt of the reckless disregard for safeguards that has contaminated water supplies and caused irreversible harm, some of which we can't even begin to quantify.

My colleague aptly identified multiple issues and examples from Ohio that explain why it is necessary to protect our water, whether it is toxic chemicals from a train derailment; a burning lake—imagine that; or compromised drinking water due to algal blooms, which happened in northeast Ohio in our Great Lake, Lake Erie, which is a significant resource for us in our Ohio community. A good clean water source has been impacted, and many others across the country could be as well.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation unquestionably undermines the Clean Water Act, and it is unnecessary and a glaring attack on future attempts to protect our Nation's water quality.

When a rule is undone using the Congressional Review Act process, future administrations are prevented from issuing rules that are substantially the same, which could and very likely will undermine agencies in their activities

to stop bad actors who pollute our waterways.

I understand the need for regulatory certainty, and I certainly want to help us achieve that. Whether it is to provide certainty for businesses, local governments, State governments, farmers, hunters, fishers, or builders, Americans deserve that certainty.

Mr. Speaker, isn't it important to ensure that our constituents, including my constituents in Ohio's 13th District, have certainty when they turn on the tap that they are sure they are not drinking toxic water that may be a carcinogen that will impact their health in the future?

It is important that all people, regardless of where they live, or their economic standing, creed, or color, have access to clean water. It is how we put people above politics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" emphatically.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of today's waters of the United States, WOTUS, joint resolution of disapproval, and I stand in opposition to the Biden WOTUS, which is an attack on the Clean Water Act, an attack on States' rights to have oversight over non-navigable waters, and an attack on private property rights.

As the chairman and former ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee, I have spent the last 2 years traveling to more than 40 States to hear directly from producers about the challenges they face. I was proud to be with Chairman GRAVES in his district, where we had a gathering and a hearing, a listening session on this very topic—burdensome regulations, record inflation, high input costs, the politicization of crop protection tools, supply chain disruptions, and now you can add an egregious government land grab to the list.

Make no mistake about it, this rule isn't about clean water. It is about the Biden EPA's appetite for power.

America's farmers, ranchers, and landowners deserve a WOTUS definition that is fair to agriculture and maintains the historical reach of the Clean Water Act, neither of which is accomplished by the Biden administration's flawed rule.

Simply recognizing longstanding agriculture exemptions that have been too narrowly applied for decades does not make up for once again plunging our rural communities into regulatory ambiguity.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman SAM GRAVES and Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee Chairman DAVID ROUZER for leading this important effort, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting “no” on this effort to undo the EPA’s waters of the U.S. rule.

EPA’s rulemaking will simply restore the basics of what was protected by law for nearly 50 years before Trump’s rule went into effect. It is an important protection to restore smart clean water protections.

We need to step forward for clean water because over half of our rivers and lakes in our country are too polluted for swimming, fishing, or drinking. I grew up near the Potomac River, where it was dangerous to get into something that was so incredibly dirty.

Americans are speaking up, and they say they want to swim and fish in their streams.

This EPA rule is also a step forward to protect wetlands. Last month, Stanford scientists showed that our country is responsible for more wetland loss and degradation than any other country.

We need to protect the wetlands that we still have left. Wetlands sequester carbon, which helps us in our climate change goals. Wetlands are a habitat that will help us stop the biodiversity crisis.

There is also a lot of talk about stakeholders wanting certainty in what waters are covered. I am on board with that certainty, and the new rule-making provides just that, certainty for the Americans who want swimmable, fishable, drinkable waters and who want a safe climate and thriving biodiversity.

I had the honor of serving on the Science Committee for 8 years, and we heard again and again that virtually all scientists believe that water is the absolutely most essential requirement for life. Yet, we want to gut the most important rule to protect our water.

Undoing the waters of the U.S. rule is a step backward. For all Americans who want the certainty of a safe climate and clean water for the future, I have to vote “no.”

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Missouri for yielding and for his leadership on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 27, providing for congressional disapproval of the Army Corps of Engineers’ and the EPA’s rule expanding the definition of waters of the United States.

This rule is one of the latest examples of regulatory overreach that the Biden administration has chosen to pursue, ignoring Congress’ role in making policy decisions and vastly increasing Federal authority over private lands.

Expanding the WOTUS definition creates harmful uncertainty and increased

administrative burdens for many parts of our economy, especially our farmers and agriculture sector.

On top of having to endure the effects of high inflation, supply chain disruptions, and labor shortages, farmers in my district and across the country now have to invest more time and money on compliance costs to protect themselves against potentially crippling legal penalties.

Between President Biden’s attempts to repeal stepped-up basis, the SEC’s onerous ESG proposal, and now this WOTUS rule issued by the Army Corps of Engineers and EPA, it is clear that family farms and small businesses are not being prioritized or heard by this administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of one of the largest corn- and soybean-producing districts in the country, I understand the importance our farmers have in feeding our Nation and the world. Our farm economy is the lifeblood of rural communities, and this resolution is a necessary first step in supporting our farmers and small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution.

For 50 years, the Clean Water Act has safeguarded our rivers, streams, and wetlands from pollution and degradation. Before the passage of the Clean Water Act in 1972, New York City dumped millions of gallons of raw sewage and trash into the East River every day. Today, thanks to the CWA, we have made significant progress cleaning up the East River and the Hudson, so much so that marine life, like the humpback whale and dolphins, have been spotted in recent years.

This environmental progress is not unique to New York. Communities across the country have experienced the benefits of cleaner water, but the advantages of the CWA aren’t limited to the environment. The law has also helped our economy.

Yesterday, during a Small Business Committee hearing on this topic, the owner of a South Carolina seafood company testified on the fundamental importance of clean water to his business. Robust Federal protection for clean water is a prerequisite for the success of businesses in a range of industries all across our country.

Despite this, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to allow industries to pollute our waters while shifting the cost of pollution to families, businesses, and communities downstream. They want to continue Trump administration policies that

significantly limited Federal protections for clean water by excluding safeguards for many wetlands and streams.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this resolution.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. VAN ORDEN).

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Biden administration’s rule defining the waters of the United States, or WOTUS.

I am not going to mince words. These proposed changes would be more aptly named “WOKEUS,” as they are confusing, partially nonsensical, not based in science, and will cause many unintended consequences that the Biden administration has clearly not contemplated.

Under this new rule, over 85 percent of the waterways in Wisconsin’s Third District would be subject to EPA regulation. In many places, these rule changes will actually harm the environment, as many of the farmers in my district are pioneers in environmental stewardship.

They have dug retention ponds that collect agricultural runoff, and then the nitrates and phosphates settle to the bottom. They recycle the water and these important nutrients, which actually lowers the costs and prevents them from entering the watersheds in the Mississippi River.

If this “WOKEUS” goes into effect, these revolutionary farming practices will stop and these agricultural by-products will wind up in our actual navigable waterways. Then what will the Biden administration propose doing? Fining our farmers, putting them out of business, and increasing the food costs that are already out of control due to the out-of-control spending of the Biden administration.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with the farmers, and they stand in support of the CRA. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand with them.

□ 1315

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has 20 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the House resolution.

As a water attorney and a natural resource attorney, I have fought for over 25 years to protect water and property rights and to stop the unlawful rules enacted by our Federal Government. In Congress I am continuing that fight.

The Feds have far exceeded their authority under the Clean Water Act and have expanded on the scope and intent of the original law by redefining what is a navigable water of the United

States. This rescinds the recent changes made under the Trump administration that actually carried out the intent of the Clean Water Act, and the increasing regulation of both land and waters must be stopped.

In many instances, these new and punitive regulations are a de facto taking of private property. Wyoming farmers, ranchers, builders, energy producers, and small business owners, among others across the State, would suffer significantly if these changes to the navigable waters of the United States definition were enacted.

This is just one more example of an out-of-control and unelected Washington bureaucracy intruding into our personal lives and seeking to destroy our property rights.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support today's disapproval vote and protect Americans from the ridiculous government overreach these WOTUS revisions would enable.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GRAVES for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a case of no good deed goes unpunished.

Now, the ranking member, a good gentleman, and I can agree that we all want clean water. But this is just simply a Federal Government overreach. That is all it is. And, oh, by the way, I will remind everybody that it is only 2 months ago my friends on the other side of the aisle controlled this body, the other body, and the Presidency.

If they wanted to pass a law, then why didn't they?

It is because they can't pass a law.

This isn't about the Clean Water Act because the Clean Water Act still exists. This is about a rule made by bureaucrats down the street to control the water in your backyard.

Mr. Speaker, if you have a child's swing set where they have hollowed out underneath the swing set, don't you dare fill it in, otherwise severe penalties—criminal imprisonment—can be imposed on you.

This is absolutely outrageous, unnecessary, and must be stopped.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to make a note that the argument that this is like a taking does not hold any water—excuse the pun—because a 1992 case in the Supreme Court determined that rules like this actually do not qualify as a taking under the U.S. Constitution or under U.S. law.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DUARTE).

Mr. DUARTE. We need to protect wetlands, and we need to protect the clean water supply we enjoy here in America.

The Supreme Court has been dealing with this for years, and if we don't get it right here and keep the agencies honest, we are going to have real food shortages on our hands.

I am a farmer who was prosecuted under the Clean Water Act for growing wheat in a wheat field where I had planted wheat many times before.

This right here—I want to make sure the whole Chamber can see it—look hard. This little light spot in the field is a jurisdictional wetland under some definitions of the Clean Water Act. That is not a navigable water. There are no frogs, no fish, no storks, no egrets, and no water.

Under the Biden rule, the surrounding grasslands—all the surrounding grasslands there, not the electrical tower in the back, that has other regulatory problems—those are jurisdictional wetlands under the Biden rule.

They prosecuted me as a farmer for farming wheat in a wheat field which had been farmed many, many times before, and they threatened to fine me \$28 to \$40 million for tilling through 22 acres of wetlands such as this across a 450-acre wheat field.

This is what we are talking about. We don't have to talk about burning rivers or poisonous water. This is the land grab, this is the authority, and this is the threat to the American food system that we are talking about.

Right over there, that is a government expert team paid for by your Department of Justice—our Department of Justice—sitting in a 3-foot hole investigating my 4- to 7-inch tillage through a vernal pool. Ten government investigators were on my property for 10 days producing over a \$1-million report.

The smallest of these wetlands—of these vernal pools—was 16 square feet. Think of the card table you may have sat at as a kid during Thanksgiving, Mr. Speaker. That was deemed a jurisdictional wetland.

This is a direct attack on our farming and our food supply. Please don't understand it as anything different.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to go back to an argument a previous speaker made about the Democrats having the majority in the House, the Senate, and the Presidency.

It also should be on the RECORD that the other side of the aisle had the majority in the House, the Senate, and the Presidency in 2017 and 2018 and also did nothing on this rule. It wasn't important enough for them to do anything.

Then the President's rule at the time moved forward, and it was tossed by two different courts. It was rejected by the courts, which leaves us in this position where we are today of playing ping-pong with the waters of the U.S. rule.

Our argument today is: Let's bring certainty to the Clean Water Act, bring

certainty to the waters of the U.S., reject H.J. Res. 27, and move forward with the existing rule from the current administration.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

My colleagues again are here to talk about something that has been over and over again changed with the whim of every administration it seems. I have been here 10 years, and every new Congress there is a different enforcement. The law keeps getting changed. There is no certainty.

So how are we supposed to farm and grow the crops that people depend on in this country?

I am glad I got to follow Mr. DUARTE because his operation is actually in my district up there where that went on. We tried to convince them at EPA and Army Corps of Engineers that farming is a normal activity.

I get my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when they start talking about rivers on fire and things like that.

This is normal farming. The way we are going here, we will not have these crops that Americans depend on, especially coming from California.

So the definition that is being put forward by the Biden administration is something that is undoing what the Trump administration had trying to bring it back to reasonable.

The Clean Water Act was passed in 1972 and signed by President Nixon with bipartisan effort. Every 50 years or so we have to go back and see what is going on with oversight, and this isn't working. It is not working at all because it was never intended by Congress to limit farming and to take away the farming of food, which is what is going on with this act.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN).

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GRAVES for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, agricultural producers have been forced to operate their businesses under three different definitions of water in the last 10 years, and this most recent rule removes longstanding bipartisan exemptions for common water features like ponds and streams found on family farms and other private property.

With this vote, Congress has a golden opportunity to stand up not only for people who feed, fuel, and clothe us all, but also for all Americans whose businesses and private lives will be affected by this Big Government encroachment onto their property.

While President Biden would like to federally regulate every small stream, ditch, and puddle from sea to shining

sea, American producers have been the careful custodians of their own resources for centuries. They are the original conservationists, and their livelihoods already depend on their voluntary efforts to care for their water resources.

How we vote today will speak volumes. We can either tell Americans that we believe the Federal Government knows best, or we can tell them that the Federal Government should get out of their way and let them do what they do best. I know where I stand.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear that I do agree with some of the comments made by the previous speaker that this has been a ping-pong match among administrations over the last 10 years where all Americans have lived under various definitions of this rule.

I, too, want to end that ping-pong match which is why I am calling on the House of Representatives to vote "no" on this resolution and get on with the certainty that the current administration's rule provides.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Mr. Speaker, this picture accurately captures the administration's definition of a navigable waterway. This child playing with a paper boat in a puddle created by a rainstorm would be subject to the almost comical definition of navigable waterways this bill would amend.

This child's family—if they had saved enough money to build their first home on this site with this rain puddle—could find themselves at the mercy of the impersonal, bureaucratic, and deliberately ambiguous rules of the EPA. Very quickly, this child's family would be drowned by the costs, paperwork, and Byzantine rules of a faceless bureaucracy.

Stop using EPA bureaucrats as agents against the American people: homeowners, small business owners, farmers, rural communities, and many others. These WOTUS rules are designed to give nearly unlimited power to EPA field agents to further control our delicate economy.

Nobel Prize-winner humanitarian Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, a victim of the cruel Soviet system, warned us with these words: "Unlimited power in the hands of limited people always leads to cruelty."

Protect American families and support this bill.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), who is the chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I am a third-generation hop and grape farmer from the State of Washington. Being a good steward of the environment has always been important to me, my family, and my neighbors.

For generations, farmers and ranchers across the United States have understood that in order to continue their important job of feeding the world, we must work together to protect our clean water and conserve our most precious natural resources.

And it has been to the great success. Our Nation's agricultural community has voluntarily innovated over the years, finding ways to use significantly less pesticides and fertilizers to grow even more food.

Yet, the administration has ignored all those facts and instead is coming after our private property rights with their waters of the United States rule.

WOTUS is nothing more than a power grab which would impose tighter controls over the waters the Clean Water Act never intended to regulate.

Let's be clear: WOTUS isn't just a logistical nightmare that has plagued landowners, businesses, farmers, ranchers, and rural communities across the country for years; it controls what people can build or plant in and around streams, ponds, and irrigation ditches in the middle of cropland giving the EPA unprecedented say over what people can do or can't do with their land, and it calls into question whether farmers could even begin to work their land.

This impacts our food supply, our housing industry, and many aspects that have already been severely challenged by the administration's overreaching policies.

This rule is not about clean water. Rural communities in the West and across the country like central Washington are dedicated to clean water, and they are the ones being punished by the continuing legal uncertainty that this new final rule brings.

As chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus, a bipartisan group of nearly 100 Members who advocate for property rights and clean water, I have consistently called on the administration to provide that certainty that we all want.

In fact, we have led over 200 Members in a letter urging the administration to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution, push back on this administration's egregious overreach, and fight for our food supply.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This debate we are having today is only about clean water, and we need to put people and clean water above pollution. The administration has a rule that provides certainty, and we should move forward on that. But this debate is about clean water.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of not belaboring the great points already made by my colleagues here today, I will keep this brief.

The Biden administration's WOTUS rule creates a regulatory headache for economic drivers like farmers, ranchers, small business owners, manufacturers, miners, and more. Similar to the old Obama administration WOTUS rule, this new rule is a gift to lawyers and activists.

All this rule does is give D.C. bureaucrats a chance to trade in their dress shoes for their never-worn cowboy boots, step over a few puddles and call them navigable waters, and upend the lives of rural Americans.

Time and time again, the Biden administration creates hardships for the constituents I represent. Unfortunately, I expect no less from this activist administration. It is clear that they do not consider rural America a priority.

Mr. Speaker, I support passage of this CRA to nullify the "sumbumcheous," devastating Biden administration WOTUS rule.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do have to address the comment about who cares about rural America. I am not making an argument today that any one party or any one person cares more about rural America.

However, if we are going to support rural America, keep implementing the bipartisan infrastructure law, which puts \$65 billion into broadband, including billions of dollars to expand broadband into rural areas—something happening in my State and States around the country.

Pass comprehensive immigration reform so there is a supply of workers in this country, including farmworkers.

Open up trade agreements. Open up trade for agriculture, including ag in my State, in my own district for the milk producers, the potato producers, the raspberry and blueberry producers, who are exporting product all over the country.

That is what it means—at least on my side of the State—to support rural America.

I support rural America, and a lot of folks in this Chamber on both sides support our farmers and rural America. Let's take action to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.J. Res. 27. This resolution will overturn Joe Biden's latest attempt to expand the Federal Government's jurisdiction and regulate every aspect of our lives.

The decision to return to the 2015 WOTUS rule puts burdensome regulations that will devastate small businesses, manufacturers, farmers, home and infrastructure builders, local communities, water districts, and everyday Americans across my district in Colorado and the entire country.

In short, the EPA's job-killing WOTUS regulation expands Washington bureaucrats' jurisdiction over ditches and navigable waters, threatening property rights and water rights for our communities. Rural Colorado runs on water, and this unconstitutional regulation will harm our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, SAM GRAVES, for his great work to protect private water rights. We all want clean air, we all want clean water, and we know that we do it right without bureaucrats getting in our way. I support this legislation.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GRAVES for his amazing leadership on this important topic.

The arrogance of liberal bureaucrats knows no bounds. When we think that they cannot go any further, they decide that they can regulate the rain that falls from the sky.

The waters of the U.S. regulation will cost our citizens, especially farmers in my State of Missouri, who, on average, own 300 acres, which is mostly small farms, it will saddle them with red tape.

Of course, we know why the Biden administration is imposing this on our citizens and our farmers. The administration is not at all interested in helping the average American farmer or supporting them. They are more interested in appealing to the radical environmentalists that want to control our lives.

Farmers have been hit hard with fuel costs, fertilizer costs, and supply chain challenges recently. The last thing they need is this. The EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers should rescind this rule and leave our farmers alone.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this resolution, I fully support it and urge my colleagues to pass it.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing about the issues that farmers face. I have 8,000 farmers in my district. Workforce, we hear about comprehensive illegal immigration reform, yes, indeed. But, Mr. Speaker, border security first. Border security first,

then we can help our farmers and others with comprehensive illegal immigration reform. That never seems to be on the table. Rural broadband, absolutely. We have been talking about it for far too long, and it is way late in coming.

Mr. Speaker, this WOTUS, waters of the U.S., never have I heard such a clamor from my farmers. This is such an insult, and it shows just simply how out of touch those that would propose something like this are when it is related to my farmers and the farmers throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we know that every day farmers live in an uncertain climate, to say the least, to say it literally. The Biden administration's proposal here is a far, far more burdensome regulation that will create a higher level of uncertainty, increase compliance costs for farmers during a time that costs are escalating.

This rule will literally lead to puddles and ditches on farmers' property being regulated under the Clean Water Act. Temporary puddles, temporary wetlands that evaporate in a few days they could be responsible for, very often when it is miles away from navigable waters.

If this rule goes into effect, small businesses—and landowners as well—will be forced to spend thousands of dollars on consultants and lawyers to determine if they need a Federal permit on their own land or risk expensive penalties or even jail time.

The Supreme Court will be hearing this case soon. They will certainly reverse any rule made. No WOTUS before SCOTUS.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will note that in the current administration's rule the agencies added six additional exclusions to the regulatory text for generally non-jurisdictional features under the pre-2015 regulatory effort and continues the agencies' two longstanding exclusions for wastewater treatment systems and prior converted farmland.

In addition, the final rule continues the agencies' longstanding regulatory definition of wetlands, as well. Now, that changed a longstanding definition of wetlands, something that again adds to the certainty of the rule as well as with the six additional exclusions creates more exclusions than in the Bush-era rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRECHEEN).

Mr. BRECHEEN. Mr. Speaker, Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution says that all legislative powers are to be vested in the Congress. In the Congress, not the President.

The Biden administration's WOTUS rule is a perfect example of the administration usurping the authority, the

supremacy of the United States Constitution.

This rule impacts private property, small business, farmers, ranchers, including Jess Kane—I just got off the phone with him 20 minutes ago. Jess has a ranch south of Bartlesville, and he has about a thousand acres in a floodplain. He is concerned about his ranch and how this rule of the President will impact his ability to do what he has always done and be able to manage a cow-calf operation.

Regulatory costs are a hidden tax and are now expected to be at least \$2 trillion, according to the Competitive Enterprise Institute. If you think of regulation as a tax, it comes out to more than \$14,000 per family. It is a hidden tax, \$14,000 per family, because of the regulatory state.

Congress has the authority and duty to rein this in. We must inject common sense, horse sense for our farmers, ranchers, small businesses, and private property owners when the Presidency is going the opposite direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 27 and overturn the WOTUS rule.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Last year, this Congress came together to provide historic investments in our Nation's infrastructure through the bipartisan infrastructure law, providing communities with almost \$13 billion in clean water infrastructure upgrades and creating jobs.

These clean water investments help areas like Skagit County, where I am from, which has used the Clean Water State Revolving Fund money to protect the water quality of Gilligan Creek, the drinking water source for many in that county.

Every day, more and more American families are realizing the public health, economic, and environmental benefits of the bipartisan infrastructure law, benefits that will continue as additional BIL resources are made available and implemented across the country.

The BIL is what Congress can do at its best. This resolution is not.

This resolution provides no benefits to public health. It seeks to eliminate protections for rivers, streams, and wetlands, many of which serve as a source of drinking water for hundreds of millions of Americans.

This resolution provides no benefits to our economy as a whole. It not only casts aside a time-tested, scientifically based tool to implement the Clean Water Act, but then further blocks the Corps of Engineers and the EPA from providing any additional clarity to businesses, farmers, and homebuilders going forward.

In short, this resolution is a recipe for uncertainty, for litigation, for continued gridlock, the very things that my friends on the other side of the aisle are really trying to avoid, as we are as well.

This resolution is a step backward for clean water. It is a step backward for certainty. I urge my colleagues to see this resolution for what it is. It is not for clean water. It is an attack on our clean water future. It fails to provide clarity. It fails to provide consistency for our businesses, our farmers, and for many in our communities who rely on clean water who are not businesses, who are not farmers, who are not ranchers. Many of those folks look to Congress to ensure clean water, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am urging my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 27, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, while the Clean Water Act has greatly improved the health of our Nation's waters, expansive interpretations of it have also led to a whole lot of uncertainty in the 50 years since it was passed, specifically when it comes to the definition of WOTUS.

Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration may think that they can get away with this overbearing WOTUS rule and dramatic, dramatic expansion of Federal authority, but we have to ensure that everyday Americans are not subject to this outrageous government power grab, and that is what it is.

Let's keep flawed Federal overreach out of the government by passing H.J. Res. 27.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, serving in Ohio's 9th district, and as the leading Democrat and Ranking Member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, I am keenly aware that clean and abundant water resources are vital for the success of our nation's economy and the health of our communities. The Great Lakes region which I proudly represent and champion provides drinking water for more than 40 million people and supports a \$6 trillion economy. Before us is H.J. Res. 27, another desperate attempt to weaken the Clean Water Act. After decades of reckless pollution, a fire on the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland, OH helped spark an environmental movement that brought us to the passage of the visionary Clean Water Act in 1972. The 50-year legacy of the CWA is a testament to the power of bipartisan legislation that prioritizes people and communities. If successful, H.J. Res. 27 would return us to a patchwork strategy of water management that existed prior to 1972.

H.J. Res. 27 is yet another example of partisan politics that do nothing for constituents in my district in Toledo and along Lake Erie—or our neighbors throughout the Great Lakes region. Instead, this resolution undermines longstanding guidance that protects our waters. This resolution eliminates existing clarity and certainty that businesses, developers, and farmers rely on, and it creates the opportunity for our waterways to return to serving only as waste receptacles. Even with a strong Clean Water Act, much remains to be done to en-

sure clean drinking water for all; the 2014 Toledo water crisis was the direct result of toxins in the water. Further eroding our ability to protect our waters is a disservice to everyone. Today, I will vote no on H.J. Res. 27 because protecting our Great Lakes is a priority, and I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same, so that our waterways can be protected for future generations to come.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of H.J. Res. 27, which would roll back important clean water protections.

Colleagues, for over 50 years, the Clean Water Act has served as an essential pollution prevention tool and helped us clean up our nation's streams, rivers, lakes, and wetlands.

Clean water is a human right. And it is our shared responsibility to ensure we protect human health and our environment for future generations. Whether you live in the heartland near the Great Lakes, or out west near the incredible Colorado River, we all benefit from the federal protections of our waters. As one of the architects of the Clean Water Act, John Dingell, wrote and made clear the intent was to protect "all the 'waters of the United States.'"

Wetlands, rivers, lakes, and streams must be protected and due to the 2019 repeal of this rule, there have been hundreds of development projects that were able to move forward with limited regulation, putting our water systems at risk. I would like to thank the Biden administration for their leadership on its rule to establish a revised definition of the "Waters of the United States" to protect our most vital natural resource—water.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to oppose this resolution and protect clean water for all Americans.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 27, which would overturn a recent Biden Administration regulation clarifying protection of America's waters under the Clean Water Act.

Communities in Minnesota and across our Nation need reliable access to clean water. Without clean water our communities don't have access to safe drinking water, farmers can't grow the food we eat, and our nurses and doctors can't clean their hands before a procedure. Clean water touches every facet of our daily lives, and our communities cannot thrive without it.

If passed, H.J. Res. 27 would block the latest waters of the United States (WOTUS) rule issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Army Corps of Engineers. The rule that the Biden Administration is proposing would broaden definitions of waterways subject to protection under the Clean Water Act to include connected waterways such as wetlands. The new rule also seeks to provide clarity and predictability for farmers and developers while protecting our nation's water quality and supply. H.J. Res. 27 would block this clarified rule.

For over 50 years, Republicans and Democrats have worked together to protect and restore America's waters using the authorities granted in the Clean Water Act. Members of Congress today have a responsibility to protect this important legacy. Preserving the health of America's wetlands and streams is essential to Minnesota, a state with more than 10,000 lakes and over 69,000 miles of river. Clean water touches every aspect of our daily lives, and Americans cannot survive without it.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear, H.J. Res. 27 is an attack on clean water in communities all around the country.

It should be rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 199, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SELF) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of the motion to recommit on H.R. 140;

Passage of H.R. 140, if ordered; and

Passage of H.J. Res. 27.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROTECTING SPEECH FROM GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 140) to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit Federal employees from advocating for censorship of viewpoints in their official capacity, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 218, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—204

Adams	Golden (ME)	Pallone
Aguilar	Goldman (NY)	Panetta
Allred	Gomez	Pappas
Auchincloss	Gonzalez,	Pascrell
Balint	Vicente	Payne
Barragán	Gottheimer	Pelosi
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Peltola
Bera	Grijalva	Perez
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Pettersen
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pocan
Bonamici	Horsford	Porter
Bowman	Houlihan	Pressley
Brown	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley	Hoyle (OR)	Ramirez
Budzinski	Huffman	Raskin
Bush	Ivey	Ross
Caraveo	Jackson (IL)	Ruiz
Carbajal	Jackson (NC)	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Ryan
Carson	Jacobs	Salinas
Carter (LA)	Jayapal	Sánchez
Cartwright	Jeffries	Sarbanes
Casar	Kamlager-Dove	Scanlon
Case	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Casten	Keating	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Schneider
Cherfilus-	Khanna	Scholten
McCormick	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Chu	Kilmer	Scott, David
Cicilline	Kim (NJ)	Sherman
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Sherrill
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Slotkin
Clyburn	Landsman	Smith (WA)
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sorensen
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Soto
Correa	Lee (CA)	Spanberger
Costa	Lee (NV)	Stansbury
Courtney	Lee (PA)	Stanton
Craig	Levin	Stevens
Crockett	Lofgren	Strickland
Crow	Lynch	Swalwell
Cuellar	Magaziner	Sykes
Davids (KS)	Manning	Takano
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Thanedar
Davis (NC)	McBath	Thompson (CA)
Dean (PA)	McClellan	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	McCollum	Titus
DeLauro	McGarvey	Tlaib
DelBene	McGovern	Tokuda
Deluzio	Meeks	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Menendez	Torres (CA)
Dingell	Meng	Torres (NY)
Doggett	Mfume	Trahan
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Trone
Eshoo	Morelle	Underwood
Españlat	Moskowitz	Vargas
Evans	Moulton	Vasquez
Fletcher	Mrvan	Veasey
Foster	Mullin	Velázquez
Foushee	Nadler	Wasserman
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Schultz
Frost	Neal	Waters
Galleo	Neguse	Watson Coleman
Garamendi	Nickel	Wexton
Garcia (IL)	Norcross	Wild
Garcia (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)
Garcia, Robert	Omar	Wilson (FL)

NAYS—218

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Chavez-DeRemer
Alford	Bishop (NC)	Ciscomani
Allen	Boebert	Cline
Amodei	Bost	Cloud
Armstrong	Brecheen	Clyde
Arrington	Buchanan	Cole
Babin	Buck	Collins
Bacon	Bucshon	Comer
Baird	Burchett	Crane
Balderson	Burgess	Crawford
Banks	Burlison	Crenshaw
Barr	Calvert	Curtis
Bean (FL)	Cammack	D'Esposito
Bentz	Carey	Davidson
Bergman	Carl	De La Cruz
Bice	Carter (GA)	DesJarlais
Biggs	Carter (TX)	Diaz-Balart

Donalds	Johnson (SD)	Palmer
Duarte	Jordan	Pence
Duncan	Joyce (OH)	Perry
Dunn (FL)	Joyce (PA)	Pfluger
Edwards	Kean (NJ)	Posey
Ellzey	Kelly (MS)	Reschenthaler
Emmer	Kelly (PA)	Rodgers (WA)
Estes	Kiggans (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Ezell	Kiley	Rogers (KY)
Fallon	Kim (CA)	Rose
Feenstra	Kustoff	Rosendale
Ferguson	LaHood	Rouzer
Finstad	LaLota	Roy
Fischbach	LaMalfa	Rutherford
Fitzgerald	Lamborn	Salazar
Fitzpatrick	Langworthy	Santos
Fleischmann	Latta	Scalise
Flood	LaTurner	Schweikert
Fox	Lawler	Scott, Austin
Franklin, C.	Lee (FL)	Self
Scott	Lesko	Sessions
Fry	Letlow	Simpson
Fulcher	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Gaetz	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Gallagher	Luna	Smith (NJ)
Garbarino	Luttrell	Smucker
Garcia, Mike	Mace	Spartz
Gimenez	Malliotakis	Staubert
Gonzales, Tony	Mann	Steel
Good (VA)	Massie	Stefanik
Gooden (TX)	Mast	Steil
Gosar	McCarthy	Stewart
Granger	McCaul	Strong
Graves (LA)	McClain	Tenney
Graves (MO)	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Green (TN)	McCormick	Tiffany
Greene (GA)	Meuser	Timmons
Griffith	Miller (IL)	Turner
Grothman	Miller (OH)	Valadao
Guest	Miller (WV)	Van Drew
Guthrie	Miller-Meeks	Van Dwyne
Hageman	Mills	Van Orden
Harris	Molinaro	Wagner
Harshbarger	Moolenaar	Walberg
Hern	Mooney	Waltz
Higgins (LA)	Moore (AL)	Weber (TX)
Hinson	Moore (UT)	Webster (FL)
Houchin	Moran	Westerman
Hudson	Murphy	Williams (NY)
Huizenga	Nehls	Williams (TX)
Hunt	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Issa	Norman	Wittman
Jackson (TX)	Nunn (IA)	Womack
James	Oberholte	Yakym
Johnson (LA)	Ogles	Zinke
Johnson (OH)	Owens	

NOT VOTING—13

Boyle (PA)	Leger Fernandez	Schrier
Castro (TX)	Lieu	Sewell
Cleaver	Loudermilk	Steube
Hill	McHenry	
Johnson (GA)	Phillips	

□ 1628

Messrs. BACON, LUTTRELL, LAMALFA, VAN ORDEN, WALTZ, Ms. SALAZAR, and Mr. DONALDS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mses. SCANLON, MCCOLLUM, JACOBS, and Mr. VEASEY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIF-FANY). The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 206, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Gallagher	Miller-Meeks
Alford	Garbarino	Mills
Allen	Garcia, Mike	Molinaro
Amodei	Gimenez	Moolenaar
Armstrong	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Arrington	Good (VA)	Moore (AL)
Babin	Gooden (TX)	Moore (UT)
Bacon	Gosar	Moran
Baird	Granger	Murphy
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Nehls
Banks	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Barr	Green (TN)	Norman
Bean (FL)	Greene (GA)	Nunn (IA)
Bentz	Griffith	Oberholte
Bergman	Grothman	Ogles
Bice	Guest	Owens
Biggs	Guthrie	Palmer
Bilirakis	Hageman	Pence
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Perry
Boebert	Harshbarger	Pfluger
Bost	Hern	Posey
Brecheen	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Buchanan	Hill	Rodgers (WA)
Buck	Hinson	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Houchin	Rogers (KY)
Burchett	Hudson	Rose
Burgess	Huizenga	Rosendale
Burlison	Hunt	Rouzer
Calvert	Issa	Roy
Cammack	Jackson (TX)	Rutherford
Carey	James	Salazar
Carl	Johnson (LA)	Santos
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Chavez-DeRemer	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Ciscomani	Joyce (OH)	Self
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Sessions
Cloud	Kean (NJ)	Simpson
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NE)
Collins	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Comer	Kiley	Smucker
Crane	Kim (CA)	Spartz
Crawford	Kustoff	Staubert
Crenshaw	LaHood	Steel
Curtis	LaLota	Stefanik
D'Esposito	LaMalfa	Steil
Davidson	Lamborn	Stewart
De La Cruz	Langworthy	Strong
DesJarlais	Latta	Tenney
Diaz-Balart	LaTurner	Thompson (PA)
Donalds	Lawler	Tiffany
Duarte	Lee (FL)	Timmons
Duncan	Lesko	Turner
Edwards	Letlow	Valadao
Ellzey	Loudermilk	Van Drew
Emmer	Lucas	Van Dwyne
Estes	Luetkemeyer	Van Orden
Ezell	Luna	Wagner
Fallon	Luttrell	Walberg
Feenstra	Mace	Waltz
Ferguson	Malliotakis	Weber (TX)
Finstad	Mann	Webster (FL)
Fischbach	Massie	Westerman
Fitzgerald	Mast	Williams (NY)
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Williams (TX)
Fleischmann	McClain	Wittman
Flood	McClintock	Womack
Fox	McCormick	Yakym
Franklin, C.	McHenry	Zinke
Scott	Meuser	
Fry	Miller (IL)	
Fulcher	Miller (OH)	
Gaetz	Miller (WV)	

NAYS—206

Adams	Cárdenas	Craig
Aguilar	Carson	Crockett
Allred	Carter (LA)	Crow
Auchincloss	Cartwright	Cuellar
Balint	Casar	Davids (KS)
Barragán	Case	Davis (IL)
Beatty	Casten	Davis (NC)
Bera	Castor (FL)	Dean (PA)
Beyer	Cherfilus-	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	McCormick	DeLauro
Blumenauer	Chu	DelBene
Blunt Rochester	Cicilline	Deluzio
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	DeSaulnier
Bowman	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Brown	Clyburn	Doggett
Brownley	Cohen	Escobar
Budzinski	Connolly	Eshoo
Bush	Correa	Españlat
Caraveo	Costa	Evans
Carbajal	Courtney	Fletcher

Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)

Levin
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan

Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Boyle (PA)
Castro (TX)
Cleaver

□ 1637

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Revised Definition of ‘Waters of the United States’”, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 198, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—227

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brehm
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Costa
Craig
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
D’Esposito
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxx
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fry

Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaull
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)

Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Panetta
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyuene
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—198

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman

Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Courtney
Crockett

Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Españat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee

Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Levin
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez

Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Scott (VA)
Scott (WA)
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Boyle (PA)
Castro (TX)
Cleaver

□ 1644

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, due to illness, I was unable to be present today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 140, “nay” on rollcall No. 141, and “nay” on rollcall No. 142.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS STANDARDS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JAMES). The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 501(b), and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Members to the House Communications Standards Commission:

Mr. MORELLE, New York
Mr. SHERMAN, California
Ms. UNDERWOOD, Illinois

HONORING THE LIFE OF ERIN FRASER

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Savannah Regional Film Commission Director Erin Fraser.

Erin was born in New York City in 1969. She graduated at the top of her class at Sleepy Hollow High School in Tarrytown, New York. After high school, she attended Oxford College of Emory University.

Erin's storybook career in the entertainment production industry began as a senior assistant to "Saturday Night Live's" Lorne Michaels. With Lorne, she helped in the development and launch of Conan O'Brien's "Late Night" show, as well as working on "Wayne's World 2," "Tommy Boy," and "Black Sheep."

Erin was named Savannah Regional Film Commission executive director on December 13, 2022. During her time as executive director, she made a tremendous impact on the office and the entertainment production community.

Erin married her husband Jay in September of 1997. They have three children, all of whom are either alumni or current students at Emory University.

She will be dearly missed by all who knew her. Our thoughts and prayers are with her and her family.

STANDING WITH EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA FARMERS

(Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand with farmers. For decades, farmers across eastern North Carolina have been left behind.

As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, addressing barriers to our farmers' growth and success has to be a significant priority for us.

Our farmers are struggling to break even because input costs for items like fertilizer and fuel are rising faster than commodity prices. This imbalance forces farmers to pass unaffordable input costs on to the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I know we can ease the financial burden of farmers and consumers alike by championing rural development initiatives.

Let's allow our farmers to do what they do best: feed America, because at the end of the day, food security is national security.

REMEMBERING KEVIN A. LAWLER

(Mr. LAWLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe Tuesday will mark 10 years

since my dad passed away from cancer at the age of 54.

When I think back on that moment in my life, I will never forget the last conversation that we had when he told me to always keep my moral compass, to always do God's work, and that to whom much is given, much is required.

Hopefully, over the last decade since his passing, I have lived up to his expectations as a person, as a son, as a brother, and now as a husband and father.

My dad was a recovering alcoholic. He had been sober for 20 years when he passed.

What was remarkable at his death was that over 1,300 people showed up—half of whom I had never met in my life. Almost all of them said how much "Kevin L." helped them to become sober and to live their life in a purposeful way.

I can think of no better way to honor his memory than to see the lives that he impacted during his lifetime.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to enter his name, "Kevin A. Lawler," into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and remember him on what will be the 10th anniversary of his passing.

CONGRATULATING CAPTAIN JANET DAYS

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Captain Janet Days during Women's History Month.

Captain Days is the first African-American female to be the commanding officer of the U.S. Naval Station Norfolk. This naval station is the largest naval base in the world. It is the hub of U.S. Naval operations in the Atlantic, Europe, and the Caribbean, and Captain Days is an exceptional choice to lead the station.

In her distinguished military career, she has earned seven Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medals, two Army Commendation Medals, and a Defense Meritorious Service Medal.

She has served on several ships, including the aircraft carrier USS *David D. Eisenhower* during Operation Enduring Freedom.

She is an American hero, and I am proud to honor her accomplishments on the floor today.

RECOGNIZING STRAUB BREWERY IN ST. MARY'S PENNSYLVANIA

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding management of Straub Brewery in St. Mary's, Pennsylvania, whose vice president, Cathy Lenze, recently earned the Patriot Award for her exceptional support of military employees.

The Patriot Award is awarded by the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve to recognize supervisors with outstanding commitment to support citizen warriors through a wide range of measures, including flexible schedules, time off prior to and after deployment, caring for families, and granting leaves of absence, if needed.

Cathy Lenze was nominated for the award by Straub employee Sergeant First Class Wendy Traynor.

Since 1872, Straub Brewery has had a long tradition of excellence in brewing and operations. Now in its seventh generation of family ownership, Straub has endured over a century and a half of changes, including Prohibition, and remains a proud part of life and history for western Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, as the proud father of a U.S. Army soldier, I commend Straub Brewery and its vice president, Cathy Lenze, for their example to businesses throughout our community for their commitment to our Nation's heroes.

□ 1700

REMEMBERING COACH JIM VALVANO

(Ms. ROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Coach Jim Valvano, known to basketball fans everywhere as "Jimmy V."

Forty years ago this month, the beloved NC State head coach led his underdog team to the 1983 NCAA championship. Against the odds, the Wolfpack triumphed over number one seed Houston with a game-winning dunk in the final seconds.

Coach Valvano's spirit has inspired so many on and off the court. He is also remembered for his dedication to finding a cure for cancer after his own diagnosis.

While he lost his battle with the disease, Jimmy V never stopped fighting for others. Today, his legacy lives on through the V Foundation for Cancer Research.

This week, as North Carolinians are watching the ACC tournament, we are reminded of Coach Valvano's inspirational words: "Don't give up. Don't ever give up." Go, Pack.

BLATANT FEDERAL OVERREACH

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, President Biden's proposed waters of the United States rule is a blatant example of Federal overreach. The rule will lead to further regulatory burdens on our farmers, and it gives unelected bureaucrats more power to dictate how landowners manage their own property.

Under this new guidance, the EPA would have broad authority to determine what is considered a navigable

water, which could potentially include anything from a pond to a puddle.

I would remind the President that American farmers are the original conservationists. They know how to take care of the land because that land is their livelihood.

The administration has already made life harder for our agricultural community through skyrocketing input costs, oppressive environmental regulation, and a war on fossil fuel. We should be supporting farmers' efforts instead of hamstringing them.

Do you know the water that I am most concerned about? It is not ponds. It is not puddles. It is the swamp here in D.C. that wants to take away our hard-earned property and take over every aspect of American life.

I was proud to just vote for the passage of H.J. Res. 27 today to nullify this terrible Biden waters of the U.S. rule.

LONG LIVE WOMEN

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this month we are celebrating Women's History Month. Women's History Month is a time to recognize all the work remarkable women across the world, past and present, have achieved. It is important to reflect on our accomplishments and recognize women trailblazers worldwide. It is incredible to see how far we have come.

Mr. Speaker, while we have cause to celebrate all our achievements, our work isn't finished, and more must be done. Reproductive rights are being threatened. Many women are still fighting for equal pay for equal work, and the ERA is not in the Constitution.

The fight continues until women are given the respect and dignity they rightly deserve. Let's celebrate and fight for a better tomorrow for women across the world.

"Long live women." "Que viva la mujer."

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF ETHAN QUILLEN

(Mr. HUIZENGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Lieutenant Ethan Quillen.

On Wednesday, February 22, volunteer firefighter Ethan Quillen responded to a downed power line call during a severe ice storm that swept through his hometown of Paw Paw, Michigan.

He acted like so many other volunteer firemen around the country. His incredible life of service was tragically ended in the line of duty when a falling tree struck a high voltage power line that he was standing under.

Ethan had volunteered at the fire department since 2019, eventually working his way up to lieutenant. He was a father, a husband, a Marine Corps veteran, and a hero, a hero who for the well-being of his fellow Americans and Paw Paw neighbors consistently put service over self while asking for nothing in return.

On behalf of the people of Paw Paw, Michigan, the Fourth Congressional District, the State of Michigan, and our Nation, I recognize and thank Ethan for his service and his sacrifice and pray for blessings and peace for his family.

MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, America's youth are in crisis. According to a recently released report by the CDC, more than one in five LGBTQ teenagers have attempted suicide in 2021, and one in three teenage girls seriously considered suicide in that year.

It should be no surprise that students are struggling in a country where certain politicians refuse to regulate the guns that kill their classmates and fight to ban books that tell their stories. There is a mental health crisis throughout our country that we need to address now.

President Biden and Democrats in Congress enacted the Restoring Hope for Mental Health and Well-Being Act to save lives by expanding access to mental health and substance abuse disorder treatment. Now, my Republican friends are calling to cut Federal funding to FY22 levels, slashing funding for vital youth mental health programs when the assistance they provide is so desperately needed.

For too long, Americans struggling with mental illness and substance abuse have suffered in silence, intimidated by stigma and unable to access treatment. We must change this. I invite my Republican friends to join us as we fight to change this in our country for young people.

CONGRATULATING JERICHO HIGH SCHOOL ON BEING SELECTED TO PRODUCE "FROZEN"

(Mr. SANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Jericho High School for being granted an exclusive performance of "Frozen."

Jericho is one of 52 schools in the world, and the only one in New York, to be selected by Disney to produce the musical. This impressive performance by talented students is expected to include a snow machine, a projector, puppetry, and even robotics. It will also feature songs made famous by New York Third's very own Idina Menzel,

who is the voice of Elsa in the motion picture.

I wish the entire cast and crew of Jericho High School the best of luck. As for Lauren Marchand, who is playing Elsa, it must be such an honor to play her role model and mentor in this role. Break a leg.

STOP THE WILLOW PROJECT

(Mr. BOWMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, we must all do everything in our power to organize and communicate with Mr. Biden to stop the Willow project.

We are living in a climate catastrophe. We have one human race; we have one planet; and we have people organizing across the country to make sure the Willow project doesn't happen and to make sure we invest in the clean, green, renewable energy that is going to save the human race and save the planet.

Mr. President, it was young people that organized across this country to help you get into office. Their number one issue is climate change.

Mr. President, it was young people who organized across this country to help us push back against the so-called red wave and maintain balance in the House.

And it is going to be young people who organize to help us win back the House in 2024 and help America to reach its ideals.

Stop the Willow project.

HONORING JENNY STANSBERRY ON HER RETIREMENT

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my number one caseworker, Jenny Stansberry, who is retiring after 30 years of service to the people of east Tennessee. She has been with me since I took office, and she also worked for Congressmen Duncan Sr. and Jr. prior to me taking Congress in the Second District.

Jenny and I used to hang out at Brunswick Billiards, and she is a dear friend as well as the best employee I could ever ask for. When I was running for office, Mr. Speaker, her mom offered me a Coca-Cola and she always regretted that she never allowed me to use her bathroom. She has always been very kind to me. She drove a cool GMC Acadia back in the day that was quite fetching in the Brunswick Billiards parking lot.

She is best known for her work with veterans and active military members, but she has helped thousands of east Tennesseans deal with basically every Federal agency issue you can think of, and she does it all with a warm smile that lights up the room.

This picture beside me is her farewell surprise, a poster we made of her with one of the loves of her life, Magnum P.I. Although she didn't end up with Tom Selleck—my fraternity brother, he went to U.S.C., of course, and I went to the University of Tennessee many years later—in fact, she never met him, her retirement will allow her to spend more time with the actual love of her life, Tony, and her daughter Anne, who is just a wonderful, wonderful young lady.

Jenny, thank you so much for everything you have done for me and the folks of east Tennessee. I always appreciate you. You were always good to my folks, and you have been my buddy. You will be missed.

CELEBRATING VICTORY OVER CORRUPTION

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today I am celebrating justice and a victory over big corruption in Ohio.

A jury in Federal court in Ohio found guilty and convicted the Republican Ohio Speaker, Larry Householder, and former Ohio Republican Party Chair, Matt Borges. Guilty of illegally selling off the Ohio statehouse through bribery, conspiracy, racketeering, and wire fraud, involving taking \$61 million in bribes through FirstEnergy's dark money fund called Generation Now.

Their conspiracy involved forcing \$1.3 billion of FirstEnergy losses on the ratepayers of Ohio. Shame on them.

What they were not tried for but should have been is their dangerous malfeasance in allowing FirstEnergy's nuclear plant in my district to operate in the most dangerous manner, creating the most serious set of nuclear accidents in this country's history since Three Mile Island.

Onward justice. Onward new clean energy for Ohio and America.

FEDERAL EXCISE TAX IS BURDENSOME

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the Federal excise tax is a 12 percent surcharge on the price of new heavy duty trucks, truck chassis, trailers, and semitrailers used for highway haulage. It was first instituted more than a century ago to pay for World War I for the wartime mobilization.

The FET is the highest percentage excise tax on anything in this country. The tax has really outlived its original purpose, unless you like spending. It disincentivizes truckers and trucking companies from purchasing new up-to-date rigs because the tax can add as many as \$20,000 to even \$30,000 on a high-end rig by itself, just for the tax.

Ever-increasing Federal and State emissions regulations often make it necessary for truckers to buy new trucks, especially in my home State of California. This burdensome tax hinders the ability of our truck drivers to acquire the most modern, safest, highest tech equipment.

Repealing this tax would make it easier to ship goods across the country at lower prices for consumers, saving businesses and consumers money. It will also allow our trucking fleet to modernize at a lower cost to the poor folks who are just trying to do their job.

At a time when our economy is reeling from inflation and high prices, Congress must do all it can to lower costs for small businesses and consumers.

□ 1715

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JUDY HEUMANN

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life and legacy of Judy Heumann, an internationally recognized activist and trailblazer who I am also fortunate enough to have called a friend.

As a young girl in a wheelchair, Judy was denied entry to her local public high school because she was considered a "fire hazard."

Years later after graduating from college with a degree in education, she was again discriminated against and denied the opportunity to teach. She challenged the city in court and went on to become the first teacher in a wheelchair in New York.

Her passion for justice and inclusion persisted throughout her lifetime. I was honored to work with her to craft and pass disability legislation of my own in recent years.

Judy once said: "Disability only becomes a tragedy when society fails to provide the things we need to save lives."

I will continue to pursue disability advocacy in Congress with her quote and her legacy top of mind and close to heart.

SUPPORTING A STRONG PARTNER- SHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN

(Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a strong partnership between the United States and Taiwan.

I recently returned from a bipartisan congressional delegation to Taiwan, where I met with the president and government officials of both parties, business executives, and military commanders.

The scope and severity of the threat from the Chinese Communist Party is crystallized in the Taiwan Strait, which is under constant harassment. But so also does Taiwan's vibrant democracy and strong economy represent opportunity in the Indo-Pacific.

The United States and Taiwan should help support each other's democracies through collaboration on countering disinformation and propaganda. We should also strengthen one another's economies through increased flows of trade and investment by negotiating expanded market access, common rules, and the end of double taxation on Taiwanese investment in the United States, which is especially critical as we seek to revive U.S. semiconductor manufacturing.

As the United States seeks to strengthen our position in the Indo-Pacific, let us commit to Taiwan as a long-term ally.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF ALFRED HOFFMEISTER

(Mr. DESAULNIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of Alfred "Al" Hoffmeister.

Throughout his life, Al had shown incredible dedication to his community and his country. He was a World War II veteran, serving in the U.S. Army Air Corps, and later in life when he returned home to California, he worked as a metal trading manager at Kaiser Aluminum of Oakland, California.

Al worked for Kaiser for 25 years, retiring in 1989. In his retirement, he was a strong advocate for our community's youth, serving as a leader with the YMCA and the Concord American Little League board. He also worked with the Boy and Girl Scouts of America.

Al was dedicated to his faith and was an original member of the St. Bonaventure Catholic Church in Concord where he served as an usher for many years.

Sadly, Al passed away recently, but he will be remembered for his humility, hardworking nature, and devotion to his family, his community, and this country.

Please join me in honoring Alfred Hoffmeister for his many contributions to our country.

GROWING THREATS AND HARMS FROM THE RIGHTWING JUDICIARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all

Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous material into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus to convene this Special Order hour today to discuss the growing threats and harms that we have seen from our rightwing judiciary.

From student loan debt to reproductive justice and rights, millions of Americans have found their rights stripped or their prosperity or their interests impeded.

Indeed, I stand here today on behalf of the more than 40 million working- and middle-class Americans eligible for relief under President Biden's student debt cancellation plan, who might never see that relief because a Republican-appointed Supreme Court majority chose to take up a politically motivated lawsuit brought by a network of rightwing billionaires.

To the 1.7 million Pennsylvanians afraid that SCOTUS could rip up your debt relief, I feel your pain.

As a Black woman and a first-generation college student, and a Pell grant recipient that is still in a mountain of student debt myself, I am right there with you—angry and exhausted by a system that is failing us miserably.

Like you, every single decision I make is shaped by the obscene amount of student debt I carry because I had the audacity to pursue a higher education—as the daughter of a working-class single mom from the Mon Valley, indeed.

Millions of folks can't start their lives because of the suffocating burden of their student loan debt; and yet in 2023, only 44 out of the 435 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives carry any student loan debt.

While I hope there are more of us with that lived expertise, I want the rest of my colleagues to hear about the people closest to the pain, like my sister Representative AYANNA PRESSLEY would say.

For poor and working-class folks, crushing student debt is preventing us from buying homes, for saving for retirement, starting businesses, starting families, and building generational wealth.

For all Black college graduates who owe an average of \$25,000 more in student loan debt, and for all Black women who carry the highest student debt burdens, it is an even greater barrier.

It is an economic crisis for all poor and working-class folks, and Black and Brown folks are getting hit the hardest.

In western Pennsylvania, the student debt crisis is a regional crisis holding our future hostage by preventing students and workers from accessing the

training they need for our region to become the innovation hub and leader in STEM that hundreds of thousands of good-paying jobs depend on right now.

Under President Biden's plan, one in four Black borrowers will see their debt fully eliminated, and nearly half of all Latino borrowers will be entirely debt free.

This is our best shot at addressing the systemic inequities that have forced communities of color to take on higher debt for the chance at a college degree.

On the day the Supreme Court began hearing the case that could rip away relief from this crisis, I met with a group of student organizers from western Pennsylvania on the frontlines of this fight.

Those students who camped out overnight in front of the Supreme Court in the rain to have their voices heard told me what student debt relief would mean to them. They asked me what insight I had in my first 2 months in Congress. I told them these problems are systemic, systemic both in who is behind these attacks and who they hurt the most.

My community will be punished for getting an education for the same reason half of this country doesn't have the freedom to control our bodies and our futures, and the same reason a Federal judge in Texas is expected to outlaw abortion pills.

It is the same reason that corporations are allowed to spend unlimited amounts of money on elections and the same reason corporate PACs are able to come in and blow Black women out of the water when we run for office.

It is because an unelected rightwing Republican-appointed judiciary is waging a full-on assault on our freedoms.

Those folks whose forebearers were enslaved are the folks who today are shackled by tens of thousands or even hundreds of thousands of dollars in student loan debt.

It is those who are denied access to adequate maternal healthcare by the wealthiest country on Earth that are subjected to forced birth. It is those whose loved ones fled violence for a better life but are separated from their children and locked up at the border.

The most marginalized folks bear the brunt of the reactionary rightwing judiciary's attacks—Black folks, Brown folks, trans folks, poor folks, and otherwise marginalized folks.

Our communities deserve leaders who will fight back as hard as the organizers back home fight every single day; leaders who carry student debt, who have depended on food stamps, leaders who lack access to reproductive healthcare on Medicaid, who went to public schools that were divested, who lived with poor air quality because of unregulated industry. We deserve those sorts of leaders in office to tackle these issues.

That is why I was sent to Congress.

Now I will yield to my colleagues with the lived expertise to fight for you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY.)

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and my dear friend from Pennsylvania for making this Special Order hour a priority. I know your constituents and the people of this country appreciate it.

I rise today on behalf of the people across our Nation seeking access to abortion care. While there are many forces and people at work who seek to spread lies and misinformation, let me set the record straight. Abortion care is routine medical care. Abortion care is safe. Abortion care is a fundamental human right. Abortion care is healthcare.

One in four women in this country seek abortion, women that you know, love, work, and worship with. Right now, a pending court case in Texas aims to restrict access to medication abortion across the entire Nation.

Over 40 percent of abortion care in this Nation is medication abortion, a simple and safe protocol where patients are prescribed two medications to end a pregnancy.

A single man—a far right Trump-appointed judge in Texas—stands to make a decision that could strike down the FDA's approval of one of these drugs and restrict access to care to millions; a frightening precedent.

Imagine for a moment if a judge was poised to strike down access to another safe and effective drug routinely used as part of medical care like Tylenol or Advil. We would call it out for exactly what it is: inappropriate overreach, overreach that will cause harm.

Mifepristone was first approved by the FDA more than 20 years ago and has since been used by more than 5 million people to safely end their pregnancies both in their homes and at health centers.

Earlier this year, following dedicated advocacy by myself, my colleagues, and advocates across our Nation, the Biden administration permanently lifted in-person dispensing requirements for mifepristone, allowing retail pharmacies to stock the medication and further expand access to medication abortion.

This medication is safe and necessary. Not only should abortion care be available, but what type of abortion care a patient receives should be decided between a patient and their doctor, not some partisan court.

At a time when abortion access is already out of reach for millions after the fall of Roe, taking mifepristone off the market would further compromise abortion access across the country, including in States where the right to an abortion is protected, like my home State of Massachusetts.

This case is another emboldened rightwing judge trying to take away our bodily autonomy. Again, mifepristone is safe, it is effective.

For people across our Nation who are seeking care, you can go to

AbortionFinder.org to navigate how to get the medical care which you seek.

This is a deeply volatile and hostile time to be a person in America in need of reproductive healthcare.

I will never stop pressing for our full humanity and bodily autonomy. My body, my choice. Your body, your choice.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, I thank, once again, my dear colleague, SUMMER LEE of Pennsylvania. We are so glad you are here in Congress. Again, I am grateful for this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of over 40 million people from all walks of life burdened by our unjust student debt crisis—the grandparents, the Black and Brown folks, women, students, members of the LGBTQ community, workers, parents, teachers, young people, and more, everyone who organized, mobilized, and shared their stories to make the case for national student debt cancellation.

After years of advocacy, President Biden heeded our calls. With the stroke of a pen and clear legal authority, he canceled student debt and opened a path for millions to get ahead, make ends meet, build generational wealth, grow their families, purchase homes, and narrow our shameful and growing racial wealth gap.

But callous and spiteful Republican officials and their allies on the courts are, once again, poised to stand in the way of progress. They see the transformative power of canceling student debt. They see how sorely needed it is. They see how powerful it is. So, they are choosing obstruction, even for their own constituents.

While this far-right Supreme Court deliberates and continues to leave our borrowers in limbo, let me make it plain: Student debt cancellation will change and save lives. While there are those who seek to play with your life, Democrats are here fighting to change and save lives with policies that go as far and as deep as the hurt is.

The President's authority to cancel student debt is clear. The administration's legal case is sound. The only question is, will the Supreme Court uphold the law? It must.

Mr. Speaker, 40 million people stand to benefit from this transformative plan, including over 100,000 people in my district, the Massachusetts Seventh. We can't stop and we won't stop fighting to deliver this critical relief the President promised.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important topic that we are here tonight to discuss, the rightwing reactionary judiciary.

I will start by reading a quote that was set out in an article written by Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein and published in *The Washington Post* back in June 2022. They cited President

George Washington, our Nation's first President, in his 1796 Farewell Address, where he cautioned that American democracy was fragile. "Cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government," he warned.

He was warning us about what could happen to our democracy. The article that Woodward and Bernstein wrote in June 2022 was talking about the scandal that they broke back in the 1970s involving Republican President Richard Nixon and how he tried to subvert the electoral process by burglarizing the Democratic Party headquarters and, by espionage, sabotage, and false information, how he used that to arrive at his opponent in the general election, how he subverted the Democratic primary process to select the candidate that he wanted to run against, and he was successful.

It was Woodward and Bernstein who revealed what is known as the Watergate scandal, which led to the resignation of Richard Nixon. In his wake, he left a game plan as to the weaknesses in our democracy that he was able to exploit.

Then along comes Donald Trump. This is what the June 2022 article was about, how Trump took it to the next level, another Republican President. What Trump tried to do in subverting our electoral process was to actually subvert the electoral college count process, first by the fake electors scheme and then using them to force the Vice President to stop the count and send the fake electors and the electoral count back to the States so that he could win the election.

When that failed, President Trump dispatched an armed and violent mob to the Capitol to actually stop the counting of the electoral votes. That is our history.

It was the United States Supreme Court that stopped Richard Nixon, but if it had been Donald Trump and today, I am not sure that today's Supreme Court would have stopped Trump. Why? Because our Court has been captured by rightwing extremists. Our United States Supreme Court has been packed by Donald Trump and MITCH MCCONNELL with extreme rightwing ideologues who are intent on taking us back into an archaic time in the Nation's history when women had no rights, Blacks had no rights, anyone other than White males in America had no rights, not equal rights.

This Court was packed with these rightwing extremist ideologues when MITCH MCCONNELL refused to engage in the appointment and confirmation process for Merrick Garland 10 months before the Presidential election, announcing the theory that there is a new rule that, during an election year, we can't appoint a new Justice to the Supreme Court.

That position, caused by the death of Scalia, was left vacant until such time as Republicans won the Senate and

Donald Trump came into office and was able to appoint a Justice to the Supreme Court that should have been a Justice appointed by President Obama.

He got two more picks during his years, and he picked Federalist Society judges. He had made a campaign pledge to appoint them. These are Justices that come from a political organization, the Federalist Society, with political ideals and objectives.

They have three new Justices appointed. They already had two that were on there, so now we have a supermajority, every one of which belongs to the Federalist Society and every one of which was selected by the Federalist Society for their seat. These Justices have a program that they are carrying out. It is the Republican playbook.

One of the things they want to do is take away power from President Trump, not because of any lofty ideal but simply because it is President Biden who announced the policy.

One of the things that is getting ready to happen is the Court is prepared to strike down student debt relief for millions of Americans, despite the fact that the clear language in the statute allows for the President to have that discretion. The Supreme Court will find a way, as the lower courts have done, to prevent the President, this President, from exercising that executive authority.

It is another demonstration of why the public has lost confidence in the United States Supreme Court. With that loss of confidence in the Court comes a loss of confidence in the rule of law.

Justice and the rule of law are bedrocks of our democracy. If the people lose confidence, it doesn't work.

What is the solution to this dilemma that we face? I have a couple that I have proposed. One would expand this United States Supreme Court, unpack it. They say that you are trying to pack it, but no, we are trying to unpack it. They packed it. Republicans packed it. We are trying to unpack it.

It is for the sake of our democracy that we need to pass legislation that unpacks the Court and expands it with four additional seats.

Something else we need to do is that we have reached a point where lifetime tenure does not work anymore. We have Federalist Society Justices on the Court and Federalist Society judges throughout the Federal courts who have lifetime tenure. They are young. They can change our society for the next 30, 40, 50 years, so we have to have reform in our courts.

We have to expand the ranks of the Federal district court judges, the Federal circuit court judges, and, yes, the United States Supreme Court.

We need to add term limits to the United States Supreme Court so that there is a regular infusion of modernity and sensibility to the Court so that it does not grow old, stale, and stodgy. I have legislation that would create such a regimen of 18-year term limits for Supreme Court Justices.

Last but not least, you would be surprised to know that, unlike other Federal court judges who are bound by a code of conduct, the Supreme Court Justices are not bound by a code of conduct.

That is how you can have a situation where a Supreme Court Justice can have a wife that is taking money from interests with cases before the Court, putting that money in the pocketbook of that spouse which is enjoyed by her husband sitting on the Supreme Court.

They don't have a code of ethics, so we need a code of conduct that is applicable to the Justices on the Supreme Court, and I have legislation that would provide for that, which needs to be passed as well.

I know, Congresswoman LEE, that I have exhibited extreme wokeness today, and I apologize to this body for descending into wokeness, but I wouldn't really want to be any way other than woke.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK).

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing us to address the floor this evening, and thank you to the Congressional Progressive Caucus for holding this Special Order hour.

I rise today on behalf of the millions of Americans whose student loan debt balances are at risk of escalating due to the rightwing reactionary judiciary.

Hundreds of borrowers from across the country gathered in front of the Supreme Court on February 28 to express their discontentment. West Palm Beach resident Kayla shared: I think President Biden's loan forgiveness plan is a good thing for college students who don't have funds to pay for college. Indeed, this is a good thing.

One important aspect of the debt relief program is that it addresses the unequal burden that student debt has placed on borrowers of color.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, 40.2 percent of White undergraduate students use student loan debt to pay for their school, while 50 percent of Black students use student loan debt. In addition, approximately 72 percent of Latinx students take on debt.

By providing up to \$20,000 in debt relief to borrowers that received a Pell Grant, President Biden's plan would allow one in four Black borrowers to see their debt fully eliminated, and nearly half of all Latinx borrowers to be entirely debt free.

This is so important because Black and Brown college graduates owe an average of \$25,000 more in student loan debt than their White counterparts.

Furthermore, Black bachelor's degree holders have an average of \$52,000 in student loan debt. Over 50 percent of Black student borrowers report that their net worth is less than they owe in student loan debt.

The disparity between the amount owed by Black and White borrowers

quadruples 12 years after graduation. Four years after earning their degrees, 48 percent of Black students owe an average of 12.5 percent more than what they borrowed. After that same time period, 83 percent of White students owe 12 percent less than what they borrowed.

In addition, women hold nearly two-thirds of outstanding debt in this country. Black women carry the highest student loan debt burden of any race or ethnicity.

We must address the unequal burden that student loan debt has had on borrowers of color. I ask the majority of the Supreme Court to turn against the right-wing, reactionary agenda and to deliver for the 40 million people in June.

We rely on our education systems. Education and higher education is one of the pivotal equitable points that we have in this country. We must protect it for everyone.

The destiny of our country is dependent on everyone being able to matriculate through school, pursue their education, and give back to this country that we love so much.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for holding this Special Order hour. To the Congressional Progressive Black Caucus, and the anchor, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. LEE), it is an honor to be here this evening to speak on behalf of the student loan borrowers. But it is also a special honor to be here tonight with my Howard University alumna.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues with the Congressional Progressive Caucus for raising up the danger of the far-right court.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MCGARVEY), my colleague.

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago this Monday, in the middle of the night, without warning, four Louisville Metro Police Department officers bashed in the door of a 26-year-old woman's home.

Startled and terrified, as any of us would be, she and her boyfriend leapt from bed. Her boyfriend grabbed his gun and fired a single shot in the direction of the intruders.

In the barrage of return fire, she was killed in her home, cowering by her bed from intruders she never knew were police.

Then silence.

It took 2 months before we learned that that woman was Breonna Taylor.

Laurie Anderson said:

You die three times. First, when your heart stops. Second, when you are cremated or buried. And third is the last time someone says your name.

Say her name. Breonna Taylor.

Breonna Taylor was a caregiver from a young age, an EMT who saved lives; a young woman looking for her American Dream, not just a nameless victim.

Breonna Taylor was loved and had so much to give. Breonna Taylor's math

teacher called her brilliant, saying, "she had a beautiful mind and she was very helpful to others."

Breonna Taylor was someone's sister. Breonna Taylor was someone's girlfriend.

Breonna Taylor was someone's daughter.

Breonna Taylor was someone.

Breonna Taylor was 26 years old, with dreams, plans, and her whole life in front of her.

We will never forget how Breonna Taylor died.

We also have to remember how she lived; that is the life that was taken that night: 26 years old, convicted of no crime, charged with no crime. Didn't even know it was the police who had broken into her home.

It took 2 months before we even knew to say Breonna Taylor's name.

It was 2 months of the LMPD hoping Breonna Taylor's death would be swept under the rug.

We know that LMPD was there without probable cause on a deliberately falsified warrant.

We know that this extreme tragic, horrific killing was not an isolated incident.

We know this because yesterday, 5 days before the third anniversary of Breonna Taylor's death, the United States Department of Justice released a report that unequivocally found disturbing patterns of systemic racism within the LMPD.

This report is based on an exhaustive, nearly 2-year-long investigation into the LMPD. But there is nothing in these pages we didn't already know.

Still, the report is damning. It is heartbreaking to read.

However, this report is a beginning, and not an end. We should seize this moment to right past wrongs and protect everyone in our community.

But let's not forget, Breonna Taylor should be alive today. Her mom would rather have Breonna alive than a report.

Breonna Taylor's death should not have been the catalyst for change and accountability. We should have addressed this a long time ago.

Breonna Taylor deserves justice and, while we can't bring her back for her family and friends, we can help keep Breonna's spirit alive.

We should remember Breonna Taylor as the funny, bright, caring, and loving young woman she was, and carry her memory with us as we take action to demand real, lasting change.

Let's say her name. Breonna Taylor.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MCGARVEY, particularly for lifting up and saying the name of Breonna Taylor here in this space and recognizing the continued struggle for accountability for the thousands, now, way too many, victims of police violence whose names we could not say in this short hour that we have here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for her leadership. Hopefully, we have been able to share some very important thoughts. I thank her for presiding and leading us on this very important discussion.

We have a Constitution. I hope that I will be holding the Constitution in my hand in a short while.

Obviously, Article I is the Congress. We are to represent the people of this Nation.

Article II is the executive branch.

Article III are supposed to be unfettered, unbiased courts, the Federal courts. They come in a variety of shapes and sizes all over the region, all over the Nation. They are what we call Article III courts.

Certainly, there are State courts, and there are county courts, and there are city courts, but the Federal courts are the place where we believe that there should be the infrastructure of justice, where I can come, where no place else, I might find justice. I can even be pro se. That means, without counsel.

But the laws and the responsibility of the judges, clearly, are to make me feel that I will be receiving justice.

So it saddens me, as a member of the Bar, and someone who, through law school, viewed the Federal judiciary in the highest esteem.

I was an Earl Warren training fellow. Earl Warren, the Supreme Court Justice, Republican, appointed by Eisenhower, I recall, and who presided over the *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education* that opened the doors for many to be able to have an education that was not segregated, and many other cases that the Court presided over.

But there was something unique that, I believe, that held our consciousness. We always felt that the courts would render truthful judgments, or that they would look for the truth, and that they would discern, between the plaintiff and the defendant, who was telling the truth; and they would rule in justice and the law for those who told the truth.

I hold in my hand the Constitution that also includes the Declaration of Independence, where we all are created equal, with certain inalienable rights, of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I loved what the Founding Fathers said: The power under the Constitution will always be in the people and it is entrusted for certain defined purposes.

It is important to note that even though the men who have said these words were not perfect, the words epitomize who we are; that no matter who you are, what "unempowerment" you may have, you should have power in the courts. You should have power in this country, by the very essence of the Constitution.

So I watched with intensity, as a Member of this body, and as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, all of the confirmation hearings where they were selecting a United States Supreme Court Justice.

What struck me most of all, to the last two Justices before Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson, is the questioning after questioning to ask them, was *Roe v. Wade* sound law?

Was *Roe v. Wade* precedent?

Was *Roe v. Wade*, for them, a standard of the whole question of precedent that is a basic premise, tenet, basic foundation of the justice that we look to have rendered; that we can count on the Supreme Court's decision; whether it is *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education*—maybe that is not solid law, that you can no longer segregate, discriminate in education at all levels; break the chains of segregation in the one-story, one-room schoolhouse with no books, for the Colored children, the Negro children, the Black children, in that instance, which the South proceeded to try and go around by having these private schools.

So, your whole life is around getting justice; and *Roe v. Wade* was to indicate a stop to back-alley abortions; women dying; being maligned and disgraced; maybe not able to have children ever again. We were able to perceive that that was really a medical decision, and it was a decision that a woman's faith, doctor, and family would help her make; that no one could police your body; that *Roe v. Wade* was the law of the land.

Yet, in a matter of months—I thought it was just simply seconds—puff went *Roe v. Wade*, even in spite of the testimony of the two Justices promoted to the Supreme Court by the former President of the United States that, over and over again, in answer to the question, they said, *Roe v. Wade* was precedent. That it was the law of the land.

They were under oath, and they did not tell the truth because what happened is that when the *Dobbs* case came, they immediately jumped to their personal views, their personal beliefs, their personal dislikes, their personal cause and crusade, and ruled abortion, as defined by the Ninth Amendment, of which *Roe v. Wade* was based on, the right to privacy, unconstitutional.

I don't even know how that could be.

□ 1800

And States like Texas followed with the most heinous of abortion laws that you could ever imagine, criminalizing providers and criminalizing women; creating a havoc in our State; people having to flee across State lines because they could not get the honest and safe medical treatment needed, that was dictated by their physician, their healthcare provider; threatening healthcare providers; threatening Planned Parenthood; threatening clinics; misinterpreting medical procedures as abortions.

I, frankly, believe this MAGA extremism is the very reason why the great tsunami that was expected in the 2022 election did not happen. They did not pay attention to, in 2021, 861 women

died of maternal causes in the United States. In the U.S., two-thirds of those pregnancy-related deaths were preventable, and for every pregnancy-related death, there are 70 pregnancy-related near-death experiences.

It is extremely important that we tell it like it is: Women fleeing to get healthcare; doctors being arrested; nurses being arrested, under law, because of *Dodd*; and, of course, women themselves being threatened.

Let me just read some headlines that came about through this *Dodd* decision where the Justices would not adhere to the truth and the honesty of their testimony during confirmation hearings under oath where they said that *Roe v. Wade* was precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the *RECORD* an article entitled: "Five women sued Texas over abortion access."

[From BBC News, Mar. 9, 2023]

FIVE WOMEN SUE TEXAS OVER ABORTION ACCESS

(By Holly Honderich)

Ms. Zurawski spent three days in intensive care, leaving the hospital after a week, the legal action says. The ordeal has made it harder for her to conceive in future, she said.

The four other women had to travel outside Texas for an abortion.

One of the plaintiffs, Ms. Miller, said: "Healthcare should not be determined by some politician with no understanding of medicine or the critical role that abortion care plays in pregnancy. How is it that I can get an abortion for a dog but not for me?"

Two of the women's fetuses had conditions that meant they did not develop a skull, according to the lawsuit.

These cases "are just tip of the iceberg", the Center for Reproductive Justice's Ms. Northup said.

Their 91-page complaint asks for a ruling that clarifies Texas' law and its stance on "medical emergencies" for pregnant women facing grave health risks.

"With the threat of losing their medical licences, fines of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and up to 99 years in prison lingering over their heads, it is no wonder that doctors and hospitals are turning patients away—even patients in medical emergencies," the lawsuit reads.

According to a survey by the Pew Research Center conducted last year, 61% of Americans say abortion should be legal in all or most circumstances, though the opinion poll found public support for the procedure fell as a pregnancy progressed.

Texas' legislature, which is under Republican control, has been at the forefront of anti-abortion legislation, becoming the first state to enact a near-total ban.

And the state will be home to another abortion battle soon: a Texas judge is expected to rule on a case about abortion pills this week.

The Trump-appointed US District Court Judge Matthew Kacsmaryk will decide whether Mifepristone—one of the two drugs used in an abortion pill regime—can continue to be sold in the US.

Five women who say they were denied abortions in Texas despite facing life-threatening health risks have sued the state over its abortion ban.

Texas bars abortions except for medical emergencies, with doctors facing punishment of up to 99 years in jail.

According to the lawsuit, doctors are refusing the procedure even in extreme cases out of fear of prosecution.

In a statement, the office of Attorney General Ken Paxton said he would “enforce the laws” of the state.

Mr. Paxton “is committed to doing everything in his power to protect mothers, families, and unborn children”, the statement said.

The Center for Reproductive Justice has filed the legal action on behalf of the five women—Ashley Brandt, Lauren Hall, Lauren Miller, Anna Zargarian and Amanda Zurawski—and two healthcare providers that are also plaintiffs.

The pro-choice group said it is the first time pregnant women themselves have taken action against anti-abortion laws passed across the US since the Supreme Court last year removed constitutional protection for abortion rights.

“It is now dangerous to be pregnant in Texas,” said Nancy Northup, the centre’s president on Tuesday.

With Ms. Northup outside the Texas Capitol in Austin on Tuesday, the plaintiffs—two pregnant—shared harrowing stories of their previous, lost pregnancies.

According to the legal action, all were told that their fetuses would not survive, but were not given the option of an abortion, which they described as “standard medical procedure” throughout the country and in the state before Texas’ ban came into effect.

Ms. Zurawski, 35, said she had become pregnant after 18 months of fertility treatments. She had just entered her second trimester when she was told she had dilated prematurely and that the loss of her foetus, whom she and her husband had named Willow, was “inevitable”.

“But even though we would, with complete certainty, lose Willow, my doctor could not intervene while her heart was still beating or until I was sick enough for the ethics board at the hospital to consider my life at risk,” Ms. Zurawski said.

For three days, trapped in a “bizarre and avoidable hell”, Ms. Zurawski was forced to wait until her body entered sepsis—also known as blood poisoning—and doctors were allowed to perform an abortion, according to the lawsuit.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, one of them could not get care until they got blood poisoning, when the doctor was willing to see them.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The Washington Post: “Woman says she carried dead fetus for 2 weeks after Texas abortion ban.”

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 2022]

WOMAN SAYS SHE CARRIED DEAD FETUS FOR 2 WEEKS AFTER TEXAS ABORTION BAN

(By Timothy Bella)

Marlena Stell’s happiness turned to heartbreak after she found out about 9½ weeks into her pregnancy that she had suffered a miscarriage.

After she was told last year that the fetus did not have a heartbeat and she no longer had a viable pregnancy, the Texas woman asked her doctor to perform a dilation and curettage, or D and C—a standard procedure to remove the fetus following a miscarriage to help prevent infection or long-term health problems. Stell had the procedure after her first miscarriage in 2018 in Washington state, when she felt so much pain that she could not walk, and she wanted to go through with it again before trying again for a second child, she told The Washington Post.

But Stell was even more devastated to learn that because the procedure is also used during abortions, which a Texas law had greatly restricted, the doctor did not want to perform a D and C. Stell would be forced to

carry her dead fetus for two weeks before she could find a provider to give her the medical intervention that physicians had denied her.

“My doctor had said that since the heartbeat bill had just passed, she didn’t want me to do a D and C. And she asked that I try to miscarry at home,” said Stell, 42, of Conroe, Tex. “It just was emotionally difficult walking around, knowing that I had a dead fetus inside.”

Stell, a beauty influencer with about 1.5 million YouTube subscribers, is sharing her story in the weeks after the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade as a reminder that the restrictive abortion laws adopted by states such as Texas could affect those who have suffered miscarriages.

“People need to understand how these laws affect all women, even cases like mine,” she said. “I feel like it’s very dangerous for government of any type to be intervening in a woman’s care because there’s multiple reasons of why she may need a procedure.”

Stell’s story is an example of what physicians and patients could face when it comes to care for miscarriages and maternal health almost a month after the Supreme Court’s ruling in Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization.

As The Post recently reported, doctors in multiple states say the standard of care for miscarriages, as well as ectopic pregnancies and other common complications, are being scrutinized, delayed, or even denied. In Texas—where Attorney General Ken Paxton (R) is suing the Biden administration over federal rules requiring abortions to be provided in medical emergencies to save the life of the mother—some doctors are reporting that pharmacists have begun questioning patients who they suspect could be using their miscarriage medications for abortions.

“It is traumatizing to stand in a pharmacy and have to tell them publicly that you are having a miscarriage, that there is not a heartbeat,” Rashmi Kudesia, a fertility specialist in Houston, told The Post on Saturday.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists estimates that more than 1 in 4 pregnancies end in miscarriage, the spontaneous demise of a fetus that commonly happens because of chromosomal abnormalities.

The methods of treatment for miscarriage and abortion are the same. A miscarriage can be treated using a mix of drugs such as mifepristone and misoprostol, or through a D and C, which includes dilating the cervix and clearing tissue from the uterus.

After her initial miscarriage in 2018, Stell and her husband had their first child, a daughter, in April 2020. When the couple moved from Washington state to Texas in 2021, they were trying to have a second child, Stell said, even though she knew she was at high risk because of her age, previous health problems and miscarriage. So when she found a doctor who specialized in high-risk pregnancies last summer, she was thrilled to find out that the early weeks of her pregnancy looked promising.

“I was about 7½ weeks pregnant, and everything looked great,” Stell said. “The doctor said there was some movements and fluttering, but everything with the pregnancy looked normal.”

Because she was at high risk, Stell was asked to come back about two weeks later for a follow-up appointment in late September 2021. Because coronavirus-related guidelines prevented her husband from accompanying her in the room, she planned to record on her cellphone what the doctor had to say about the ultrasound.

“I’m getting ready to record because I’m excited,” Stell recalled. “But as soon as she started the ultrasound, [the doctor] got really silent, and was just looking and looking

and didn’t see the fluttering or the movement or anything.”

Stell got the news she feared: She had lost the pregnancy. She was told she had a blighted ovum, which is when a fertilized egg implants in the uterus but does not develop into an embryo.

She was shocked to learn that the common procedure she got so easily in Washington state was anything but simply obtained in Texas. She said she was told she needed additional proof, or multiple ultrasounds, showing that her pregnancy was not viable before she could get a D and C. Nine days into carrying her dead fetus, the sorrow of her first miscarriage had returned.

“I felt like a walking coffin,” she said, fighting through tears. “You’re just walking around knowing that you have something that you hoped was going to be a baby for you, and it’s gone. And you’re just walking around carrying it.”

Stell eventually found an abortion services provider in downtown Houston who would give her the D and C on Oct. 4, 2021. After she was met by antiabortion protesters, Stell opened up about the experience on her YouTube channel. While Stell, a cosmetic brand owner and CEO, usually talks about makeup education and other beauty and lifestyle content, the influencer’s video on her miscarriage showed a different side.

“I get so angry that I was treated this way because of laws that were passed by men who have never been pregnant and never will be,” Stell told her followers at the time. “I’m frustrated, I’m angry, and I feel like the women here deserve better than that. It doesn’t matter what side of the fence that you want to sit on, laws like this affect all women regardless of what situation you’re in, and it’s not right.”

When Roe was overturned last month, Stell said it was her duty to share her story with those who might have similar experiences. After Stell told her story to CNN this week, Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) was among those to cite her as an example of how “Republican politicians are risking women’s health and safety.”

Stell said on Twitter this week that the experience almost 10 months ago is the reason she and her husband have decided that they would not try to have additional children in Texas. She told The Post that her two miscarriages put her at higher risk for a third.

“Our fear is that if I get pregnant and miscarry again that something will happen,” she said. “We just do not feel confident at all that we’ll get the care that we need in Texas if something were to happen.”

If the miscarriage hadn’t happened, Stell and her husband would have had a boy in May. They would have named him Milan. She thinks about what could have been when she reflects on her own story, and how she said she was made to feel as though she had done something wrong when she was already grieving.

“It’s added trauma on top of trauma,” she said. “It’s important to share this story so people know how these laws affect all women.”

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, is there freedom in this Nation? Because of the Texas abortion law, her wanted pregnancy became a medical nightmare. The truth had been taken away.

“Texas woman almost dies because she could not get an abortion.” These are not willing activities. These are not persons who do not have loving relationships with children. These are not individuals who, in fact, are, if you will, persons who want to rush for an

abortion. These are individuals who have had children, who have loving children at home, but have a right, with their medical provider, to deal with their medical procedure.

It is important to take note of the fact that what happens in the courts can truly save lives or cause a loss of life.

In addition to due process under the Fifth Amendment, equal protection of the law under the 14th Amendment, and the right to privacy that this little book holds, the courts play a major role.

I thank Congresswoman LEE for leading us in a discussion that challenges the question of truth, the question of unbiased, unfettered decisions, and the question of adherence to the Constitution.

Right now, we are living in a land where the precedent of *Roe v. Wade*, the right to choose—I never call it the right to an abortion. It is the right to choose, and the medical procedure that you choose should never be limited.

How sad that we have this litany of women, only a few of the thousands impacted because the court refused to adhere to justice and truth.

We, as Members of Congress, need to be able to be the people's representatives, and we must find a way to bring dignity and truth and justice back to our courts.

I, for one, will continue to work to make sure that this is a living document, the Constitution, and that those who are poor or not can find their way to a courthouse under Article III and find justice, freedom, righteousness, and the opportunity to live freely without discrimination in education, to have civil rights and voting rights, and to be able to have jurisdiction over your own body as a woman and to adhere again to a law by the Supreme Court that said, in *Roe v. Wade*, that women do have that choice. For me, it is the law of the land, and Dodd is a masquerading factor of bias and untruth.

Mr. Speaker, I join my Congressional Progressive Caucus Colleagues here today to speak about the danger that is among us as a result of far-right rhetoric that has resulted in the take down of women's rights in America.

Republicans have continuously proven that they want to police women's bodies and take away our reproductive freedoms.

In the first week of the 118th Congress, extreme Republicans launched attacks on reproductive freedom, intruding on medical decision-making, and keeping their promise to criminalize abortion nationwide with no exceptions.

Now a Texas Federal Judge is attempting to get rid of the much-needed abortion pill.

Women's health is an issue that is very near to my heart.

With reproductive rights being stripped from us, maternal mortality at an all-time high, and violence against women that has surged since the pandemic started, there is growing concern that women's health will continue to suffer on a massive scale.

This attempt to remove medically necessary health care is a disgusting misuse of power and it extremely negligent.

Maternal mortality is an issue that continues to plague the United States health care system.

In 2020, 861 women died of maternal causes in the United States.

In the U.S., two-thirds of those pregnancy related deaths are preventable and for every pregnancy-related death, there are 70 pregnancy-related near-death experiences.

It's extremely important that we remove barriers in health care that may be contributing to these deaths.

Maternal mortality is caused by several issues such as cardiovascular problems, high blood pressure, blood clots, and complications of labor and delivery.

Maternal mortality is caused by several issues such as cardiovascular problems, high blood pressure, blood clots, and complications of labor and delivery. And Black Maternal mortality is a National Health crisis.

Women's health is an issue that is very near to my heart. With reproductive rights being stripped from us, maternal mortality at an all-time high, and violence against women that has surged since the pandemic started, there is growing concern that women's health will continue to suffer on a massive scale.

I thank the Congressional Progressive Caucus colleagues for having me here today to talk about this important issue.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congresswoman. I thank, once again, my colleagues at the Congressional Progressive Caucus for raising the dangers of this far-right court but also for their leadership, their commitment to fighting back, to finding solutions and finding pathways to restore and protect the freedoms of millions of Americans and to create ethical pathways to opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

INFLATION IS DEVASTATING TO AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, just getting ourselves set up. I was going to yield some time to a fellow Member for a moment, but I think that Member has disappeared.

We are going to try something tonight. And for anyone watching and listening, if you don't like lots of geeky conversation and lots of math, this isn't your night to watch.

We are going to try to walk through a handful of concepts. One is one we have been discussing with our economic team.

Look, I am blessed to be on Ways and Means, but I also am the senior Republican for Joint Economic. I have a handful of Ph.D. economists, and we have been sort of trying to understand what the Federal Reserve is doing on inflation and why it is becoming so difficult to crush inflation in our society and in our economy.

Then we are going to walk through some numbers so there is an absolute

understanding of what has happened, particularly to the working middle class in this country, demonstrate how much poorer they are today than even a couple years ago in purchasing power and the reality of just how devastating inflation is to people, people that save, people that tend to have a retirement, actually people who are just trying to make a living and survive. We are going to show some charts just demonstrating how much poorer Americans are.

Then we are going to do some walking through Democrat policy, particularly from the last couple of years, and sort of show the fact that their math is not lining up with what we are seeing and their math is not lining up with other economists. The reason for that is, at the same time, we are going to also talk about how much debt has been created in the last couple years, that what was demographics—we are getting older as a society—and actually what was just spending priorities of the left.

Much of this we are running and gunning. We got the President's budget a couple hours ago. We are trying to assemble an understanding. But just a demonstration of here are the tax hikes, here are the spending priorities, and trying to also run ahead of the propaganda mills that often what our modern media is on: "They are going to cut the deficit." No, they are not. They claim \$3 billion. Well, there is like \$3 trillion over the 10, but it is a time where there is going to be \$20 trillion of borrowing. So, okay, that is if every tax hike goes in and it does not slow down the economy.

So, first off, a concept. The Federal Reserve, when they are raising interest rates, when they are rolling off the book of bonds, all of the holdings they have, even mortgaged-backed paper, what are they doing? No, seriously, I need everyone to sort of think this through. What are they doing? They are basically pulling liquidity out of the economy by removing the cash. Because in the previous couple of years, pandemic, whatever excuse you want to give, this body pumped massive amounts of liquidity.

Here are checks; we are not going to ask you to work; you don't have to participate in the economy. All that cash is sitting out there. Then you hit everything from supply chain issues to manufacturing issues to people saying: I get money, I don't have to participate in the economy, so I don't have to work.

You get inflation. Remember our high school economics classes. What is inflation? Simplest definition: Too many dollars chasing too few goods and services.

So why has the interest rate hikes and the pulling of liquidity out—because, remember, the Federal Reserve is doing more than raising interest rates. They are letting their balance sheets roll off, and by rolling that off, that should also be stripping much liquidity—why isn't it working? There

are certain things we are seeing. Commodity prices seem to be coming down. Wage hikes are not keeping up, though, with current inflation, which is a really bad, bad thing.

But if you look at every model we had from the second quarter of last year, third quarter, and fourth quarter of last year, we should be much further in the progress of knocking down inflation than we are.

I know there was some dodgier economic news today. But yesterday, remember seeing the 2-year treasury bill going over 5 percent? Then it fell. But just the fact that it hit, I think, one of the all-time highs in modern times, unless you understand how much of the market thought inflation is staying with us longer.

Our economists actually came back with a theory. So you have the Federal Reserve trying to pull liquidity out, but on the other side of this equation, you have fiscal policy. This Congress, when it was controlled by the left, our Democrat brothers and sisters put so much cash, so much money into the economy, as we start to walk through some of the things that were happening, the American Rescue Plan, the omnibus bills that actually raised spending. You add everything from even the CHIPS Act and all of these other things where you are pumping in money.

So you understand the point I am trying to make is, if you cannot line up fiscal policy—and fiscal policy is what we do in Congress—what happens when it is working contrary to monetary policy. Monetary policy is what the Federal Reserve does. And we are starting to actually see a really, really interesting—let's call it an academic debate, except it hurts people.

You know, I am a Congress-idiot standing up here going: You understand this and that? But ultimately, these numbers hurt people, and I am going to show you how much poorer most Americans are today.

So how many times have you heard any Member of Congress get behind these microphones and say: Maybe we should really think about our spending priorities, either stripping some of the spending that happened last year under Democratic control and saying, okay, maybe that is the program the left will fall on their sword for, maybe spread it out over more time so it is not working contrary to what the Federal Reserve is trying to do in knocking down inflation.

It is an interesting thought, but it is worth thinking about, that the financial markets, the old days of inflation is always a monetary issue. Okay. I will make you the argument that the Federal Reserve, in the previous years when they were buying so much U.S. sovereign debt, they were like the uncle who keeps buying the alcoholic son bottles of scotch. They were enablers. They made it so we didn't have a penalty. Except now it is time for us to start going to our AA meet-

ings, and we don't have a driver's license anymore; we are not getting there; it is not happening. And we are having a little trouble getting to the first step. What is the first step? You admit you have a problem.

This one is important. Let me know—I am sure the AA references work, but that was top of mind.

□ 1815

How much has President Biden added to the deficit in these last couple of years? I want to be a little careful on this. There is this running argument here. The left will say: Your incentives to grow the economy, your tax reforms, this and that, that is all it was that added all of it. We will, in turn, say: Democrats, it is all of your spending.

I am partially pointing this out in reference to: Why haven't we been able to knock down inflation more?

It is this spending. When you start to realize that it is well over \$5 trillion of additional spending that the Democrats created over the last couple of years—you may love it. It may be a thing in your priorities. Fine, but then understand how much poorer you are through inflation because this works contrary to trying to slow down inflation.

It is the concept of fiscal policy crashes into monetary policy, and then you start to wonder why the high school math we were all taught and how this is supposed to work isn't working.

Let's walk through what we have done to working men and women in this country. I represent the Scottsdale-Phoenix area. For most of the last 2 years, my neighborhoods have had the highest inflation in America. When America is over here saying, "We had 8 percent inflation, and it is devastating," I am having 13.1 percent. You are that hardworking person in my community, and you have had your teeth kicked in.

This is important. I am heartbroken we don't talk about this more. Inflation has dramatically reduced workers' purchasing power. Let's go all the way to 10 years. You had a 2 percent, 2 percent, 1.8, then 2.3, and then you hit the last 2 years.

Let's say that, in 2013, you are making \$60,000 a year, and you haven't had a pay increase. You understand the baseline. You are making \$60,000 in 2013 and have kept the same salary. That is 10 years. Dear Lord, I hope you have been paid more, but let's say you are not. That \$60,000 today would only buy \$46,000 worth of goods. You have gone from \$60,000 of purchasing power in the 10 years to \$46,000.

In 2021, functionally, that single year, if you are being paid \$60,000, by the end of the year, you have lost about \$8,000 of purchasing power. That is the mean. In my State and my community, it was substantially more than this.

Do you understand where that money went? I promise you this is going to be

a little more geeky, if that is actually a word. Where does the money go? When we devalue your salary, when we devalue your currency, where does that money go? We take it from borrowers and those who—what is the easiest way to say this—we took your salary, your savings, and we devalued it and put it over here to those of us who borrow. Who is the biggest borrower? The United States Government. So, we are going to now pay back the debt with inflated dollars.

It is not a magical, free option. You didn't suddenly say, "Hey, we got \$30 trillion in debt, and we are going to pay it with dollars now that are only worth 90 cents. Isn't this neat? We took 10 cents off of our debt." No, we didn't. What we did is we stripped it from you.

We taxed you, and you didn't even know it. Do you understand because we stripped the value of your salary, the value of your savings, it was functionally transferred to the United States Treasury and devaluing the debt when we pay it back?

How many Americans understand that the last 2 years, I think, statistically, may be the largest tax hikes in modern history? We made you poor. There is even some crazy math out there, if you take a look, that will show you debt to GDP, at least for like a month, flattens a bit because the economy continues to grow nominally over inflation or at inflation, and that debt, we are going to pay it back with the inflated dollars. Hey, doesn't this look great? Except the very next day, you need to float the next refinancing of your bonds on the new debt. It is at the higher interest rates, and boom. The little pretend value you got is stripped away from you. You may be paying back the U.S. sovereign debt with inflated dollars, but now you are paying a hell of a lot more interest.

That is why I started with the comment, did you watch the debt markets this last week? They are all over the place. We refer to that as fragility. We are carrying so much debt, and it is about to get dramatically worse.

How many times have I been behind this microphone walking through showing you and showing you and showing you that, in 10 years, the wheels come off?

The danger that I was terrified of over the last couple of days of what happens if the debt interest rate cycle—that 2-year yesterday being over 5 percent—what if that lasted for a year, 2 years, 3 years? All the CBO projections we are working on are wrong.

I hope today's retrenchment in the numbers is a good thing, but it also may be a thing because we are hurting people. This is the next part of this moral argument. We have made you poorer.

Do you understand what the Federal Reserve may have to do to you? They may have to take a substantial portion of this society and put you out of work. They may have to put you out of work.

Part of it is because Congress kept spending, making it even harder for the

Federal Reserve to bend the inflation curve. Yes, I understand there are supply issues and demand issues. They pumped in too much liquidity. The Democrats did all this spending. It got ahead of us. Policies here are really hurting people.

Let's take a little bit more of a look at how this math works. I am going to do it again. Your 2021 salary—so in a single year—you are making \$60,000, and its purchasing power is \$52,000. If you live in my district, it is probably about \$47,000. How much did your salary go up? If you live in my community in Arizona, if you didn't get about a 13 percent pay hike in the previous year, you are poorer today.

If you look at it from 2013 to today, once again, your purchasing power when you used to have \$60,000—let's say you were a saver, you had \$60,000 saved. You do realize today, and this is, functionally, the very beginning of the year, you basically only have \$46,000 in the bank. You may think you have \$60,000, but the purchasing power has been lost so much.

Let's walk through one of the things I believe is another fraud that is being committed on the American people. That is when our brothers and sisters on the left did all of their legislation last year to functionally subsidize—as I almost prefer to say, they soft-nationalized so much of the economy.

They did all sorts of projections on what certain things were going to cost. I am going to use a couple of things these. There was functionally a tax credit for battery production. The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, put out this score and said it is only going to be about \$30 billion—only.

We have outside economists looking at it, reading the statute, saying that it doesn't actually say \$30 billion. What it says is anyone doing this, you get these tax credits. Then, they looked at how many people were doing that. We are seeing articles coming in now that it may be as high as \$195 billion.

This is one of the great scams around here. They put together a piece of legislation saying that you are going to get the tax credit but then don't put a cap on it, so it just keeps going because, let's be honest, who writes checks to the Democrats?

As we are dealing with budget issues, will our brothers and sisters on the left at least work with us? You promised America that this particular battery tax credit would not exceed \$30.6 billion, so will you lock in a cap?

Remember the fragility concept when lots of other—the statute didn't cap the money, so it looks like it is going to cost dramatically more. Will you work with us, and will you cap it? Do you think that is going to happen around here?

Let's take a look at some more of this, the cost estimates on wind production. You may love wind. Once again, the Congressional Budget Office and the piece of legislation that Democrats did last year show an expansion

of tax credits on wind. They promised us that it would come in at \$11.2 billion. The outside economists are looking at the legislation once again and saying there is a math problem, that they didn't actually cap it, and it may come in as high as \$68.4 billion.

Is that a fraud on the American people? Of course, it is, but that is the way the scam here works. Produce a piece of legislation and tell everyone it is only going to cost this much.

The point I am going at is that the Inflation Reduction Act, which is an Orwellian name for a piece of legislation that spent money and actually helped set off inflation, you start to understand why so many of the big spenders, the people that get these, were just giddy. They actually read the language.

My challenge to our friends on the left—okay, this was your promise, \$11.2 billion. Will you cap it at that? The modeling now is coming in, and it may be as high as \$68 billion. This is why we end up in so much trouble here.

I am not going to try to read all of these to you. If any of you have insomnia, please, go grab the President's budget.

Do you remember that NANCY PELOSI used to stand behind that microphone over there and say budgets are your ethics, your priorities? We are going to look at a lot of the left's priorities here.

This is just one of a couple of boards of tax hikes, tax hike after tax hike after tax hike. I cannot wait until we try to figure out some way to model these tax hike boards and try to understand the level that this actually slows down the economy.

You are going to see some boards here where I am going to make the argument that the duplicity we are seeing in the President's budget just blows off the page with the amount of GDP, the size of our economy, that is going to go to taxes, and then to pretend it is still going to grow.

No, that would be cruel and unusual punishment to read through these. Understand, this is just one board, two boards. These are all the proposed tax hikes that are in the President's budget.

□ 1830

And then they are going to tell you this nice thing saying: We are raising taxes enough to reduce the deficit over the next decade by \$3 trillion.

They forget to mention we are borrowing 20.

So I put a little board together saying: If every single one of their tax hikes come in, and every single one of them produces the revenue that they scored it at—and these actually haven't been calculated. They are just baseline scores. There is no actual analytics behind it—and if it doesn't actually slow down the economy and doesn't actually now create incentives for people to put their resources in other places other than these areas

that have all had the tax hikes, then it might produce \$3 trillion over the 10 years.

Okay, great.

We are heading toward a projected accumulated deficit from the 2024 budget to the 2033, so functionally 9 budget years of \$20 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, if you have someone on the left running around here saying: "We are doing something for deficit reduction," something where you basically go from: Hey, we were going to hit 118 percent of debt to GDP in 2033, then they might bring it in if they got all their taxes and all the revenues came in and they don't slow down the economy, then they might get 110 percent.

So let's walk through what is being proposed here.

Remember, we are just starting. We are digging through this as fast as we can, and we are trying to, once again, understand their priorities.

So just some of the basic taxes, over the next 10 years, in the budget process, an average level of taxation has been about 19.7 percent which is actually higher, I think, than the historic average. But you basically look at higher than any 10 years—let me rephrase that: The 19.7 percent of GDP going into taxes, that is functionally the baseline math of the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, you do realize that functionally it is higher than any time in modern history. I have been here before over and over and shown the charts that are saying: Here are really high marginal tax rates.

We get about 18 percent of GDP in taxes.

Here are really low marginal tax rates.

We get about 18 percent of GDP.

I am just wondering what magic wand the left is waving that is all of a sudden we are now going to start getting close to 20 percent of the economy in taxes.

Maybe they come up with some magical way to do it.

The problem here: This is the President's own budget. So you just saw 19.7 percent of the economy coming in in taxes. The new spending is at 24.8 percent of the economy. And then we are going to have people running around here, particularly on the left, saying: Look what we did for deficit reduction.

Huh?

Trust me, there are no saints here. The hardest thing I say over and over and over—and I probably get more hate from this, but it is absolutely mathematically true—from today through the next 30 years, 100 percent of future U.S. sovereign debt—100 percent of future sovereign debt—is demographics. Baby boomers. We got old.

If you are someone who is screaming at the television or whenever you watch things like this, Mr. Speaker—which if you are watching things like this then I worry about you—"it is foreign aid," we have shown over and over

and over and over the calculations that foreign aid last year would only be like 12 days of borrowing. At the end of the decade, it is only like 6, 7 days of borrowing.

Congressional salaries. It was 28 minutes of borrowing for a whole year, and in 10 years from now it is like 19 minutes of borrowing.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, you have got to stop pretending. The scale of the debt, once again—and I did this last week and the week before, the Congressional Budget Office's model said that in 9 budget years, you are can to wipe out the entire defense of the United States, which is our constitutional obligation.

You can wipe out all of Congress. You can wipe out the White House, and you can wipe out the Supreme Court. You can wipe out every dime of spending. There is no FBI, there is no Park Service, there is nothing, no discretionary dollars at all, and you still have to borrow a couple hundred billion dollars just to maintain the baseline services of Social Security and Medicare.

And the very next year—the punch line here is that the very next year it gets much uglier because that is also the year the trust funds are empty. The Medicare part A trust fund is gone. That is also one of the other frauds we are seeing in the President's budget: We are going to shore up Medicare.

You do understand the Medicare trust fund is only the part A. Three-quarters of the other spending of Medicare is already coming out of the general fund.

So, once again, that previous sentence—you have to let that one sink in—you can get rid of all discretionary spending. No more of this crap of: Let's just get rid of foreign aid or waste and fraud. It is all gone. You just get rid of all of it, and in 9 years—9 budget years—you have to borrow a couple of hundred billion dollars. And that is being optimistic that there is no recession, that all the revenues come in in projection, there is no war, there is no other pandemic, and everything is fine.

Mr. Speaker, do you understand how fragile—and then the Democrat spending is approaching 25 percent of the economy.

Deficits. Now, this is with all the tax hikes and assuming that every dime comes in and that this place is willing to vote for every one of Biden's tax hikes, you are still borrowing an average of \$1.5 trillion a year, and at that 9th budget year I think it is like still like \$2.3 trillion that year because it keeps going up.

Interest payments. This is right out of the President's budget. We are going to basically average over the next 10 years the interest payments on the debt will reach \$1.3 trillion a year—just the interest—so you have the interest on the borrowing.

So if we are estimating 2033, so 9 budget years from now, if under the President's budget—forgive me, I am

doing this from memory—it is like \$2.3 trillion borrowed, 1.3 of that is just interest, the other trillion functionally is the growth in Medicare.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, the very next year the Social Security trust fund is gone, our brothers and sisters are taking about a 23 to 24 percent cut in their check, and you have just doubled senior poverty.

That is one of things that also outrages me is: Where is the conversation of we are going to save Social Security? We are going to work on it together?

Instead of using it for the next campaign piece that the left is putting together.

You are going to see also, Mr. Speaker, the left running around here saying: We are going to raise taxes on wealthy people to save Medicare.

No, they are not.

What they are going to do is actually start to add another 5 points on capital gains, the 3.8 percent special premium that they basically stole and put into the general fund that was originally supposed to go to Medicare.

Okay, let's say they now finally stop stealing it and put it all toward the Medicare trust fund part A and now it goes up to 5 points—that is only one-quarter of Medicare spending.

The model basically says that according to the President's budget, we are going to go from about \$661 billion of interest borrowing to a baseline of \$1.3 trillion in 9 budget years.

And now we start getting into the way we try to actually model much of this debt. There are ways. There is hope. The markets around the world that like to buy U.S. debt: your pension plan, your own personal savings, your union pension plan, and the State pension plan.

When I was Maricopa County treasurer, we bought it because it was safe and very liquid. We would buy UST bills, U.S. Treasuries.

One of the key things you always look at is what is the debt of a country to the size of its economy?

So if my Democratic colleagues are running around here saying: If we get all of these taxes, then we are going to lower the deficits.

It is just not true. But just even believing the top line that is written in the President's budget before we have actually had a moment to really dive in and see what the economic analytics are and do they model for how much they are going to slow the economy down and what that does to revenues, are they still just pretending they are still getting the baseline growth, then we functionally go from 98.4 percent of the publicly held debt to the size of the economy to 9 budget years we go to 110 percent.

We are basically right on top of the World War II peak. So we are basically going to line up with the highest debt to the size of the economy in our country's history.

So here is the argument I want make. Other things you should do to

maybe bring in more receipts and more revenues, okay, fine, walk us through this. I can find you some things in the Tax Code where I believe some people are cheating or are using it in ways that is not how we meant to draft it, fine, we will work with you.

But walk me through all the things you are going to do to grow the economy and not try to control it and manage it because so much of the legislation, particularly last year, was almost a soft nationalization of much of the economy.

You can't get this grant—and actually I should probably explain this—this grant unless you actually go kiss up to the White House and you actually do their bidding, their sort of woke agenda. Fine.

Another bit of the con you need to understand, Mr. Speaker, is this administration has advocated for what they call a global minimum tax. Go around the industrialized world and say: Hey, we want this 15 percent global minimum tax.

If you are a country and if you give a refundable tax receipt because you did certain activities or tax credit, those things, that goes into the 15 percent calculation another country can tax you and tax your operations because this country did this.

So, Mr. Speaker, do you actually understand why a bunch of the Democrats' spending last year they made it grants?

They basically played our European allies for fools: Hey, sign up for this global 15 percent minimum, wink wink, nod nod. But grants don't count as subsidization for businesses, and the beauty of the grants actually make the bureaucracy and whoever holds the White House dramatically more powerful.

It is a soft nationalization and a way to escape their own tax extortion.

So if I came to you tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and said that one of our most moral obligations is we have got to find a way to stabilize this national debt to the size of our economy, okay, then you have to do functionally two things. I have to bend the spending here, and I have to grow. We have to grow.

Last week, when I was behind this microphone, I had my 8-month-old little boy with me. The Parliamentarian wouldn't let me hold him. It broke my heart, but the rules are the rules.

What is our moral obligation to him?

When he turns—actually it is 24 now. It is a whole year later. When he turns 24, if we were going to maintain baseline services, then we have to double U.S. taxes. It is demographics. We got old, and lots and lots of our population, what is it, 67 million of our brothers and sisters—I am one of them—will have moved into their earned benefit years.

Okay. So you need a revolution in the cost of healthcare. I have already been behind this microphone repeatedly talking about the fact that we are on the cusp of not only curing but also

stabilizing diabetes—diabetes being 33 percent of all healthcare spending—but lots of other great things are happening.

Go look at last week's speech if you are curious, Mr. Speaker. I spent the last half of it walking through things that are actually hopeful and optimistic.

I don't particularly like this pillars of growth board because it is missing a number of things. But we are going to have to deal with the reality of our population.

In 19 years, the United States has more deaths than births.

Do you remember your high school economics class?

How do you grow an economy when your population is flatlining or is sinking?

You can do it through high-scale immigration. You could also do it through automation.

Should we incentivize robots just like they are doing in China and other places we compete with?

□ 1845

You have got to have a tax code that is all about growth. How do you say expensing?

Remember, when we had the 100 percent expensing that we did in the 2017 tax reform, the economists said that may have been the number one thing that helped us grow the economy, and you don't lose revenues from it. You actually gain revenues. It is a timing effect.

If I say, hey, you get to do expensing but you have got to do it over 7 years, or you can do it all today, it is still the same deduction. It is about the time. Because you let them do it today, it puts you in a cycle where, hey, I am going to buy the next piece of efficiency on the equipment sooner.

The model said, if you look at a longer horizon, you actually get more revenues by making it so you can have 100 percent expensing today because it forces you into a cycle where you are constantly trying to get to the next level of productivity with your capital investments.

Ideas like that in the tax code are elegant because it raises wages. It grows the economy. Remember, we are trying to actually stabilize our debt to GDP.

The last one—and I probably should come back in the next couple weeks and demonstrate—I believe we could have a revolution in regulation. I am going to try to visualize this one, so everyone work with me. If you get bored, I think I have a YouTube video from years ago I put together, a little cartoon that basically says—I think it is under Schweikert environmental crowdsourcing.

It is a simple concept. Say you want to open a motorcycle paint shop or a bakery or whatever it is, and you need your air quality permit. Let's do it this way.

Air quality permit: You fill out lots of paperwork, you hire a consultant,

you design your scrubbers, and then you walk into your county air quality office and you file paperwork.

Does a file cabinet full of paperwork make the air quality in your community better? Huh?

No. It is basically documentation so the trial lawyer can sue you.

How about if you and your community had a little sensor, had a few thousand people driving around your community—I am from a huge county—with a sensor, and if there are idiots over here painting motorcycles in the back of their yard and not doing it in a booth, okay, fine, you catch them immediately.

You crowdsource the data. You don't need an army of bureaucrats watching the file cabinets and then hiring armies of consultants.

You can crowdsource. You basically put the sensors on, give it to the Uber drivers, give it to the UPS drivers, and say, hey, we really care more about where we have a problem—and if there is a problem, we will go and fix it—than punishing everyone in our marketplace.

The people who are following the rules, the elegance of this, they get left alone. You don't have to deal with government. You get left alone. If you screw up, you get caught. That is the use of technology. That is just one very simple idea, but there are dozens and dozens like that so you could drop the size of the bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the tolerance. May I request how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For everyone who has been willing to give me part of their time, I am just trying to make a couple simple points. We have a fiscal responsibility and blame for inflation.

We could do policies on pieces of legislation that say we are going to actually help. How about a piece of legislation—actually, guess what, I already have this one—that basically says: How do I pull liquidity out of the marketplace without hurting people?

How about actually give every American a SPIF for taking some cash out of their checking account?

Instead of running out and buying a new color television—even though the televisions are beautiful—put it in their retirement account. You actually slow down consumption over here, you shore up their retirement security, and it is almost the exact same thing the Federal Reserve is doing.

There are things we can do policy wise that would help knock down inflation. We have a handful of bills like that.

The other thing is the reality of we have been lied to on the scoring of the Democrats' spending from last year, and we are starting to see it now.

The third thing I want to point out are the dozens and dozens and dozens

and dozens and dozens of tax hikes, and then the White House is pretending it is not going to change the economic velocity, they are going to get all these revenues, and they are still going to spend like crazy.

Within their morality of are they going to step up and help us save Social Security, the morality of it, are they going to actually help us grow the economy?

It is unacceptable that their big accomplishment will still be over 110 percent debt to GDP in 9 years. It is unacceptable.

Mr. CLOUD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

HONORING THE LIFE OF COMMANDER JOHN DAVIS

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his efforts to always pull the curtain back on the games and gimmicks that Washington plays sometimes and to bring creative ideas to the table on how to fix things. I appreciate it, and I thank him for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Goliad County Sheriff Deputy and Operation Lone Star Task Force Commander John Davis, who passed away this Monday.

A man of faith, integrity, and relentless dedication, John served the great State of Texas for 40 years during his law enforcement career. His career stretched over a variety of roles in local, State, and Federal agencies, and because of this, John became known as one of Texas' most distinguished law enforcement officers.

Commander Davis helped lead the effort to locate and arrest the Texas Seven escapees back in 2000. In 2022, due to his long track record of success, John was selected to command the newly formed Operation Lone Star Task Force. Most recently, Commander Davis oversaw a successful multi-agency operation in Wharton and Jackson counties to combat human and drug trafficking cartels and their criminal invasion into Texas.

Throughout his life, Commander Davis gave his all and gave all he had to protect our families and our communities and to make our State a safer place to live.

While we mourn his passing, we know that he lived a life well lived and that he has gone on to his reward. May his service be an example for all of us in years to come and may God bless and his peace be with his family.

REMEMBERING CLAUD JACOBS

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a true hero of the Crossroads, Mr. Claud Jacobs.

A native of Yoakum and Victoria, Texas, Claud lived a life of extraordinary service to his community. His life's motto, "You always get back more than you give" guided him through public service in the Governor's office and in starting multiple businesses that helped his neighbors.

Claud's faith in our savior Jesus Christ led him to be a friend to all,

dedicating his time to training young people in his community.

In 1968, his passion for at-risk youth led him to help found the Bluebonnet Youth Ranch and raise millions of dollars through charity events.

For his extraordinary work, in 1986 Claud Jacobs was knighted as a Knight of Saint Gregory by Pope John Paul II.

Claud was a friend to everyone in our community, it seems, and I know he was a friend of mine. We will miss his optimism, his warmth, and his can-do spirit.

May God bless his family as we remember him and his legacy.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

WASHINGTON MUST NOT FORGET NEW MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. VASQUEZ) for 30 minutes.

Mr. VASQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous material into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. VASQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the new Representative of New Mexico's Second District, home to some of the country's most beautiful landscapes, the hardest working people, the best chile, the Nation's first designated wilderness, seven sovereign nations, and a rich and proud binational culture.

New Mexico is my home. It is where I hunt. It is where I fish. It is where I went to school, and it is the place that gave me opportunity.

However, I continue to be troubled. After being here just over 8 weeks, one thing is clear, Congress isn't putting constituents like mine or their families first, and I want to change that.

It is hard to watch other Members from urban communities celebrate lower gas prices while residents in my rural community still pay 35 cents more than the national average.

It is hard to celebrate poverty reduction while we aren't having meaningful conversations about the child tax credit or that one in four children in my district are living in poverty.

It is difficult to spend my time voting on messaging bills while residents in our Tribal communities still have to haul water to their homes.

We must do better for the American people, and we must get to work on the real issues that impact our communities.

I know what it is like to work hard to get ahead. Since I was old enough to work, I have always had a job. I have never had the luxury of financial wealth. I have bagged groceries,

worked a drive-through at a fast-food restaurant, I have sold vacuum cleaners door to door, I have painted houses and worked at a Chile Factory, all to make a living and eventually pay my way through college at New Mexico State University.

For too many New Mexicans, working as hard as I did isn't even enough to pay the bills. They feel like the goalposts just keep getting moved on them, and they look to us for help.

But instead, Congress bickers over issues that don't move the ball forward. That is wrong, and it is time that we fix that.

New Mexico is a State rich in culture, pride, and history. It is part of the American story. But, unfortunately, it is also often forgotten.

Too many New Mexicans are struggling. Our rivers are drying, our agricultural industry is in decline, housing costs are rising, and healthcare is too expensive and out of reach.

Washington must pay attention to districts like mine, and they must see our potential. We have a robust energy industry that supports more than 15,000 good-paying jobs, but we also have high rates of respiratory disease in frontline communities, substandard living conditions and housing for workers, and little accountability for the polluting industries.

New Mexico is also a vital part of America's agricultural strength. Our farmers, our ranchers, our farmworkers from the South Valley of Albuquerque to the Hatch Valley work the land every single day to ensure that all of us, as Americans, have access to safe, U.S.-grown, affordable food.

However, we don't have enough access to H2A visas. We have made it harder for farmers and workers to get the support they need to feed our country and lower the cost of food.

New Mexico plays a vital role in our national security, from the most expansive missile testing range in the country at White Sands to the critical training grounds at Holloman Air Force Base, and the groundbreaking research produced at our two national laboratories.

However, we also lack the critical investments in housing, educational services, and transportation services to give our servicemen and -women the quality of life that they deserve when they serve our country.

Washington can no longer forget about communities like mine and about New Mexico. My hometown of Las Cruces is home to over 100,000 people, many hardworking families who are dealing with an unemployment rate higher than the national average, too many kids still going hungry, and low wages, with per capita household income in my district at just \$26,000. That is right, \$26,000.

For too long our district has been left behind. These inequities are not just felt, the numbers prove it. I am here to fix that, but Congress has to focus on the issues that matter.

I ask for your help, to not leave behind the veterans that bravely dedicated their service and their lives to this country, to ensure that we provide Federal funding for our rural communities so that every New Mexican has access to high-speed broadband and quality healthcare, to ensure that one in four New Mexicans on SNAP have access to healthy, nutritious, and life-saving food.

□ 1900

I am committed to getting the Second District's fair share in Congress. I am fighting for that in every room I enter, every meeting that I attend, and every vote that I cast. Nothing means more to me than making sure that we get our fair share from Washington, D.C.

To everyone that I have the honor of representing, I promise you I will always make sure that your voice, the voice of the great Second District of the State of New Mexico is heard in the Halls of Congress.

I ask my colleagues to join me and focus on the issues that matter to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 30. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VASQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 10, 2023, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV,

EC-575. A letter from the Commission Chair and Commission Vice Chair, Commission on Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution, transmitting the Commission on Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution Reform Report Status Update, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself,
Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California,

Mr. MORELLE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FROST, Mr. IVEY, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 1478. A bill to modernize the business of selling firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CISCOMANI:

H.R. 1479. A bill to establish the Chiricahua National Park in the State of Arizona as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 1480. A bill to authorize the National Detector Dog Training Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. FALLON, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mrs. BICE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. JACKSON of Texas):

H.R. 1481. A bill to revise the authority provided to the President to impose export licensing requirements or other restrictions on the export of crude oil from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BICE (for herself, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 1482. A bill to provide guidance for and investment in the upgrade and modernization of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Radio All Hazards network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. CASTEN, and Ms. PORTER):

H.R. 1483. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal fossil fuel subsidies for oil companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. NEHLS):

H.R. 1484. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a penalty for causing a defect in pipeline infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BUSH (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. OMAR):

H.R. 1485. A bill to limit the price charged by manufacturers for insulin; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 1486. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the

Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing, and distribution of traditional and premium cigars; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 1487. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to reaffirm the role of the Office of Personnel Management as the leader for civilian human resource management in the Federal Government, to encourage innovation in the Office's management of human capital, to strengthen the Office's ability to support Federal human capital management as a strategic priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. CRAIG (for herself, Mr. KILDEE, and Mrs. MCBATH):

H.R. 1488. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 1489. A bill to amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to repeal the drug felon ban for participation in the supplemental nutrition assistance program under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BACON, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 1490. A bill to secure the dignity and safety of incarcerated women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROW (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 1491. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the maximum loan amount for certain loans; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. PALMER, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 1492. A bill to require the Congressional Budget Office to make publicly available the fiscal and mathematical models, data, and other details of computations used in cost analysis and scoring; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 1493. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require coverage of, and expand access to, home and community-based services under the Medicaid program; to award grants for the creation, recruitment, training and education, retention, and advancement of the direct care workforce and to award grants to support family caregivers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DONALDS (for himself, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 1494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide special rules for

casualty losses incurred by reason of Hurricane Ian, Hurricane Nicole, and Hurricane Fiona; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. GUEST):

H.R. 1495. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to establish a precision agriculture loan program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mrs. HINSON, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Ms. ROSS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SORESENSEN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mrs. FOUSHEE):

H.R. 1496. A bill to upgrade the communications service used by the National Weather Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mrs. FLETCHER:

H.R. 1497. A bill to provide that, for a 3-year period, applications for the exportation of natural gas to member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization be granted without modification or delay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida:

H.R. 1498. A bill to establish limitations on the amount of debt issued by the United States which may be held by foreign governments, entities, and individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARCIA of Illinois (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CASAR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. GOMEZ):

H.R. 1499. A bill to require small, medium, and large hub airports to certify that airport service workers are paid the prevailing wage and provided fringe benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 1500. A bill to establish a program to use anonymized data from third party entities to inform infrastructure planning decisions and to improve transportation management capabilities and efficiency on Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GUEST (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. EZELL, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Mr. PFLUGER):

H.R. 1501. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from operating or procuring certain foreign-made unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 1502. A bill to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize comprehensive opioid recovery centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER (for herself and Ms. SHERRILL):

H.R. 1503. A bill to provide for digital communication of prescribing information for drugs (including biological products), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. TITUS, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada):

H.R. 1504. A bill to amend the Apex Project, Nevada Land Transfer and Authorization Act of 1989 to include the City of North Las Vegas and the Apex Industrial Park Owners Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1505. A bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. NEHLS, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. FRY, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 1506. A bill to amend section 1003 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Federal Advisory Committee Act), to prohibit the establishment of advisory committees related to environmental, social, and governance aspects; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LIEU, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SCANLON):

H.R. 1507. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require disclosure of conflicts of interest with respect to rulemaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. PERRY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BACON, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 1508. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to define "State of residence" and "resident", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. BROWN, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 1509. A bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to reauthorize the Healthy Food Financing Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. MENG, Ms. TITUS, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. CHU, Ms. SCANLON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. CARSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CASAR, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 1510. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to repeal the particular work requirement that disqualifies able-bodied adults for eligibility to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. MENG, Mr. CORREA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. ROSS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. LIEU, Ms. BUSH, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. OMAR, Mr. SOTO, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TRONE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. CHU, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. CASAR):

H.R. 1511. A bill to amend section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to render available to certain long-term residents of the United States the benefit under that section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 1512. A bill to allow women to greater access to a wider range of self-administered contraceptives approved under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 1513. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a task force to be known as the "6G Task Force", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEHLS (for himself and Mr. PAPPAS):

H.R. 1514. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of the special pension payable to Medal of Honor recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NEHLS:

H.R. 1515. A bill to require each agency to repeal or amend 2 or more rules before issuing or amending a rule; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PFLUGER (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. WENSTRUP, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. EZELL, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Ms. LEE of Florida, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. STRONG, Mr. GUEST, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, and Mr. BRECHEEN):

H.R. 1516. A bill to establish Department of Homeland Security funding restrictions on institutions of higher education that have a relationship with Confucius Institutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, and Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ):

H.R. 1517. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide grants to States, territories, and Indian Tribes to address contamination by perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances on farms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr.

SMUCKER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 1518. A bill to provide for a reauthorizing schedule for unauthorized Federal programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 1519. A bill to provide justice for victims of foreign state misrepresentation to the World Health Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANTON (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. VAN DREW):

H.R. 1520. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to reauthorize the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. EZELL, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 1521. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to expand the definition of an active duty military consumer for purposes of certain credit monitoring requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. STEVENS (for herself and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 1522. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to request the President to issue an annual proclamation designating Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Day, to designate the Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Flag as an official symbol to recognize citizens of the United States held as hostages or wrongfully detained abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, and Ms. STEFANK):

H.R. 1523. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to reduce Federal financial participation for certain States that require political subdivisions to contribute towards the non-Federal share of Medicaid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIFFANY (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. STEEL, and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 1524. A bill to provide for equal protection of the law and to prohibit discrimination and preferential treatment on the basis of race, color, or national origin in Federal actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Education and the Workforce, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. ARMSTRONG, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 1525. A bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. TRONE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BUSH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BACON, Mr. SOTO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1526. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide hereditary cancer genetic testing for individuals with a history of a hereditary cancer gene mutation in a blood relative or a personal or ancestral history suspicious for hereditary cancer, and to provide coverage of certain cancer screenings or preventive surgeries that would reduce the risk for individuals with a germline (inherited) mutation associated with a high risk of developing a preventable cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLYDE (for himself, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HERN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. COMER, and Mrs. BOEBERT):

H.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. BUSH, Ms. CARAVEO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs.

LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LIEU, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MANNING, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PETTERSEN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WEXTON, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of equal pay and the disparity between wages paid to men and women; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BUSH, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. CHU, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. MENG, Ms. ROSS, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. TRONE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. EVANS, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERRA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the recognition of March 10, 2023, as "Abortion Provider Appreciation Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. TONKO):

H. Res. 214. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Deep Vein Thrombosis and Pulmonary Embolism Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mrs. BICE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PORTER, Mr. TRONE, Mr. CORREA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. LIEU, and Mr. MULLIN):

H. Res. 215. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:

H. Res. 216. A resolution calling for the designation of Mexican drug cartels as foreign terrorist organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. PETERS, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H. Res. 217. A resolution supporting the designation of March 2023 as Endometriosis Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO:

H. Res. 218. A resolution commemorating the life and legacy of labor pioneer Kate Mullany in honor of Women's History Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 1478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is: Firearms

By Mr. CISCOMANI:

H.R. 1479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have the Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carryin into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof

The single subject of this legislation is: Chiricahua National Monument

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 1480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cls. 1, 3, 18

The single subject of this legislation is: National Detector Dog Training Center

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 1481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this legislation is energy.

By Mrs. BICE:

H.R. 1482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Upgrading and modernizing the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Radio All Hazards network

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:
Taxation

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 1484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

Penalties for the intentional disruption or destruction of pipelines.

By Ms. BUSH:

H.R. 1485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section I Article 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To cap the price of insulin at \$20 per vial for pharmaceutical manufacturers.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 1486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States

Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Tobacco

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 1487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States

Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Improve OPM's hiring flexibilities, training opportunities and retirement processing abilities.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 1488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S.

Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Lowering insulin costs

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 1489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S.

Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to repeal the drug felon ban for participation in the supplemental nutrition assistance program under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 1490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S.

Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To secure the dignity and safety of incarcerated women.

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 1491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the

United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the maximum loan amount for certain loans.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 1492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Budget

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 1493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To expand access to HCBS coverage under Medicaid.

By Mr. DONALDS:

H.R. 1494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art I, Sec 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Provides tax relief for victims of Hurricanes Ian, Nicole and Fiona.

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 1495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to establish a precision agriculture loan program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 1496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To upgrade the communications service used by the National Weather Service by implementing a commercial off-the-shelf communications solution

By Mrs. FLETCHER:

H.R. 1497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Energy

By Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida:

H.R. 1498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish limitations on the amount of debt issued by the United States which may be held by foreign governments, entities, and individuals.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 1499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill addresses pay, benefits, and labor standards for certain airport service workers. Airport service workers include security officers, food service workers, cleaning staff, ticketing agents, and retail service workers.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 1500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would better leverage technology to improve transportation management and planning for Federal-aid highways.

By Mr. GUEST:

H.R. 1501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from operating or procuring un-

manned aircraft systems that were produced in certain adversarial nations for the purpose of preventing harmful surveillance activities.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 1502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This is a single issue bill.

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER:

H.R. 1503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Healthcare

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 1504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This technical legislation simply changes the maps of the BLM to help alleviate a problem at the Apex Industrial Site.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation would prohibit U.S. courts and executive branch agencies from recognizing, enforcing, or otherwise validating any assertion of rights by an individual of a trademark that was used in connection with a business or assets that were confiscated by the Cuban regime, unless the original owner of the trademark expressly consented to the transfer of the trademark.

By Mr. JACKSON of Texas:

H.R. 1506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the establishment of Federal Advisory Committees related to Environmental, Social, and Governance aspects

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 1507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The Stop Corporate Capture Act requires disclosures of conflicts of interest with respect to rulemaking, makes improvements to streamline rulemaking and creates a new office in the executive branch increase public participation.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 1508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to define "State of residence" and "resident", and for other purposes.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is: provides mandatory funding for the HFFFI program

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Repeal SNAP time limit requirement

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a “uniform rule of Naturalization.”

The single subject of this legislation is: immigration

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 1512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide for priority review at FDA of applications for contraceptives with the potential to be safely self-administered for over-the-counter status.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a task force to be known as the “6G Task Force”, and for other purposes.

By Mr. NEHLS:

H.R. 1514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Increases Medal of Honor Recipient's pension pay

By Mr. NEHLS:

H.R. 1515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill requires each agency to repeal or amend 2 or more rules before issuing or amending a rule.

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 1516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Prohibits DHS funds from being awarded to universities that have ties to the Chinese Communist Party.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 1517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article

The single subject of this legislation is:

PFAS

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington:

H.R. 1518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I,

Section 7, Clause 1: “All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other Bills.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

Budget Process

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Victims Compensation

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 1520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Energy

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 1521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to expand the definition of an active duty military consumer for purposes of certain credit monitoring requirements, and for other purposes.

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 1522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Recognizing US hostages and wrongful detainees being held abroad.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 1523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

Restricts local government matching for Medicaid.

By Mr. TIFFANY:

H.R. 1524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the constitution

Amendment XIV, Section 5 of the constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Civil rights

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 of the Constitution of the United States

The single subject of this legislation is:

To restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 1526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Constitution, Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Coverage of Hereditary Cancer Screening

By Mr. CLYDE:

H.J. Res. 42.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 16 of the U.S. Constitution states: The Congress shall have the power to “Exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District (not exceeding 10 Miles square, as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of Government of the United States.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill pertains to DC matters

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. CLINE, Mrs. BOEBERT, and Mr. NUNN of Iowa.

H.R. 20: Ms. WATERS and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 24: Mr. OGLES and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.

H.R. 33: Mrs. RAMIREZ and Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 34: Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 35: Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 130: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 131: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 160: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 252: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 267: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 343: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 408: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 412: Mr. YAKYM and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 448: Mr. LATURNER.

H.R. 496: Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 510: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 513: Mrs. MCCLAIN.

H.R. 531: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMÉR, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. MOONEY, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 536: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 537: Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 542: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TRONE, Mr. SABLON, and Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 549: Mr. HIMES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FINSTAD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. FLOOD, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CHU, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. CORREA, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 554: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 561: Mr. LANDSMAN.

H.R. 564: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 568: Ms. PEREZ.

H.R. 589: Ms. STRICKLAND and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 621: Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mrs. PELTOLA.

H.R. 625: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 697: Ms. PRESSLEY and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 713: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

H.R. 734: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee and Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

H.R. 801: Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. CAREY, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 809: Mr. CURTIS.

H.R. 830: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 838: Mr. BOST and Mr. NEHLS.

H.R. 869: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 879: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 882: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. MANNING.

H.R. 883: Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 884: Mr. LANDSMAN and Mrs. RAMIREZ.

H.R. 885: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 899: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 901: Mr. THANEDAR and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 911: Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 949: Ms. SEWELL.
 H.R. 951: Ms. BROWNLEY.
 H.R. 955: Mr. KILDEE and Ms. ROSS.
 H.R. 976: Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BARR, and Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 1002: Mr. MFUME and Mr. CASAR.
 H.R. 1014: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1015: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
 H.R. 1018: Mr. STRONG, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. ROSENDALE.
 H.R. 1023: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 1067: Mr. ARMSTRONG.
 H.R. 1073: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mrs. FLETCHER.
 H.R. 1088: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 1105: Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 1117: Ms. WILD, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 1121: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 1134: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
 H.R. 1139: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CARL, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. SWALWELL, and Mr. SARBANES.
 H.R. 1147: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
 H.R. 1150: Mr. LIEU.
 H.R. 1208: Mr. VASQUEZ.
 H.R. 1246: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1247: Mrs. FLETCHER.
 H.R. 1255: Ms. SEWELL, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 1279: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H.R. 1280: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 1281: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1285: Mr. CARTER of Texas.
 H.R. 1291: Mrs. FISCHBACH.
 H.R. 1313: Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 1321: Mr. SWALWELL and Mr. KILEY.
 H.R. 1355: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.
 H.R. 1364: Mr. DUARTE and Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 1368: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 1388: Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. BACON, and Mr. FALLON.
 H.R. 1394: Mr. BRECHEEN and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 1396: Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Mr. SWALWELL.
 H.R. 1398: Mr. FALLON.
 H.R. 1425: Mr. STEUBE, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H.R. 1428: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 1434: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 1448: Mr. JACKSON of Texas and Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 1457: Mr. MEUSER.
 H.R. 1468: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 1475: Mr. PHILLIPS.
 H.J. Res. 18: Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California.
 H.J. Res. 33: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.J. Res. 41: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. TURNER, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
 H. Res. 33: Mr. PANETTA.
 H. Res. 72: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.
 H. Res. 89: Mr. MOONEY.
 H. Res. 100: Mr. CARL.
 H. Res. 150: Mr. LIEU.
 H. Res. 165: Ms. GRANGER.
 H. Res. 171: Mr. BACON and Ms. SCANLON.
 H. Res. 188: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.
 H. Res. 198: Mrs. LESKO.
 H. Res. 200: Ms. DEGETTE.